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CORRECTED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED
CONSTRUCTION OF A SHOPPING CENTER,
FORT BENNING, GEORGIA

To Whom It May Concern:

The United States Army Infantry Center, Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Management Division, Fort Benning, Georgia, hereby announces the completion and public availability of the Corrected Final Environmental Assessment (EA) and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) concerning the construction of a shopping center on Fort Benning, Georgia. These documents were prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) propose to construct a new shopping center for use by authorized individuals at Fort Benning. The proposed action would consist of construction and operation of a shopping center containing a main store, MCSS and a food court including an Anthony’s Pizza, Robin Hood Deli, Burger King, Taco Bell, Church’s Chicken, Manchu Wok, Charley’s Grilled Subs, A & W, and Baskin Robbins. Services would include a barber shop, beauty shop, pharmacy, alterations shop, optometrist/eye care office, flower shop, one-hour photo store, nutrition center, shoe store, amusement arcade, beauty supply, collectibles, roving concessions, category enhancer, and local artisan.

New construction would consist of reinforced concrete slab/foundation with masonry/metal stud exterior walls, steel structure and built-up partitions, AAFES-provided shelving, suspended ceilings and recessed energy-efficient lighting. Exterior support would include required utilities, communications, paving, walks, curbs, storm drainage, site improvements, electrical, mechanical, and fire protection for a complete and usable facility. Only AAFES-authorized patrons would use the facility. These patrons are primarily active duty and retired military personnel, their family members, and certain categories of reserve military personnel.

The EA evaluated the effects associated with the proposed action on soils, vegetation, water quality, wildlife, socioeconomics, land use, environmental justice, cultural resources, utilities, noise, air quality, hazardous materials containment/disposal, public health and safety, and the protection of children.

An interim draft of the EA and FNSI for the proposed action were erroneously presented to the public for review from 12 January through 11 February 2005; a notice of availability (NOA) of these documents was also posted in “The Columbus Ledger-Enquirer” during this time, in accordance with part 1501.4 (e)(1) of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and 32 CFR part 651 (Army Regulation 200-2). The documents were available at the Columbus Public Library, South Lumpkin Library, Fort Benning Main Post Library, and on the Installation website. The NOA was also mailed to all agencies/individuals/organizations on the distribution (mailing) list for the proposed action. It should be noted that all comments received during the previous public review period were received and evaluated during the completion of this Corrected Final EA.
The corrected Final EA and draft FNSI are now available for public and stakeholder review and will be at the aforementioned libraries and on the Installation website (https://www-benning.army.mil/EMD/_program_mgt/legal/index.htm) starting 30 days from the first date of publication in "The Columbus Ledger Enquirer". The NOA will also be re-distributed to all parties on the distribution (mailing) list and, when final, the resulting comments will be incorporated into the Final FNSI.

At this time, anyone wishing to comment on the proposed action or request additional information must write to the U.S. Army Infantry Center, Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Programs Management Branch (Attention: Ms. Melissa Kendrick), Building 6 (Meloy Hall) Room 310, Fort Benning, Georgia 31905-5122, or call (706) 545-9878.
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Executive Summary

AGENCY: United States Army (Army).

PURPOSE: The Army has coordinated the preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) of the potential environmental consequences of constructing a proposed shopping center at Fort Benning, Georgia (the Post), as described in the next paragraph. This EA has been completed pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA; United States Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 6050.1 “Environmental Effects in the United States of DOD Actions;” and 32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 651 (Army Regulation [AR] 200-2) “Environmental Effects of Army Actions,” which implements these regulations.

PROPOSED ACTION: The Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) proposes to construct a new shopping center for use by authorized individuals at Fort Benning. The Proposed Action would consist of construction and operation of a shopping center (Post Exchange [PX]) containing a main store, military clothing sales store, and a food court including an Anthony’s Pizza, Robin Hood Deli, Burger King, Taco Bell, Church’s Chicken, Manchu Wok, Charley’s Grilled Subs, A & W, and Baskin Robbins. Services would include a barber shop, beauty shop, pharmacy, alterations shop, optometrist/eyecare office, flower shop, one-hour photo store, nutrition center, shoe store, amusement arcade, beauty supply, collectibles, roving concessions, category enhancer, and local artisan. Recycled content products would be supplied in the PX for purchase by consumers.

New construction would consist of reinforced concrete slab/foundation with masonry/metal stud exterior walls, steel structure and built-up partitions, AAFES-provided shelving, suspended ceilings and recessed energy-efficient lighting. Construction products would meet U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recycled content requirements. Exterior support would include required utilities, communications, paving, walks, curbs, storm drainage, site improvements, electrical, mechanical, and fire protection for a complete and usable facility. Prior to construction, the Fort Benning Land Management Branch would remove all merchantable timber. Only AAFES-authorized patrons would use the facility. These patrons are primarily active duty and retired military personnel, their family members, and certain categories of reserve military personnel.

Following the construction of the proposed PX facility, Soldiers’ Support Services would be relocated to the vacated, existing PX facility (Holloway 2000). Soldiers’ Support Services is currently located in a group of World War II-era structures within an older part of the Post. Once Soldiers’ Support Services moves, the old structures formerly used by Soldiers’ Support Services would be demolished (Holloway 2000).

ALTERNATIVES: Seven action alternatives and the no-action alternative were initially considered. These alternatives included expansion of the existing building, as well as construction of the proposed new facility on five alternative sites. This also included variations of site design to minimize environmental impacts. The seven action alternatives were evaluated against specific
criteria, and four of the sites were eliminated from further consideration. One alternative complied with the criteria and is assessed, along with the no-action alternative, in this EA. The preferred site for the Proposed Action is on the north side of Marne Road, east of Interstate 185.

**SUMMARY OF EFFECTS:** This EA evaluated the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action and the No-Action alternatives on the following resources: earth resources, water resources, noise, climate and air quality, hazardous materials and wastes, biological resources, land use, cultural resources, infrastructure and utilities, and socioeconomics. Potential impacts of the Proposed Action and the No-Action alternative to each environmental resource are summarized below.

**Socioeconomics.** Impacts to demographic compositions are not expected. Although AAFES anticipates increases of approximately 2,000 persons in the customer base at the new shopping center facility, these increases would likely not reflect compositional changes according to gender, age, or race.

The increased customer base is more likely to utilize this facility due to convenience of location and tax-free goods. Total sales volumes associated with this project could increase from current levels. Because of the distance of the nearest competing shopping centers, no major effect on the local economy is expected. The project is expected to have a minor positive economic impact for the Post and surrounding areas.

**Water Resources.** Construction activities at the approximately 18.25-acre site would result in the loss of natural vegetation, with the placement of impervious surface. Because of the loss of vegetation during construction activities, highly erodible soils would be exposed and the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation to the unnamed tributaries and Hamlet Creek would increase resulting in minor adverse impacts. During construction activities, the contractor would be required to implement strict erosion control measures to prevent increased sedimentation during construction in accordance with the Georgia general permit (GAR 100001).

In addition, AAFES would be required to prepare and implement a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan, which would be part of the Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control (ES&PC) Plan that would be prepared for the construction site. The SPCC Plan would delineate measures and practices that would be implemented to prevent and/or minimize spill/release from hazardous materials into water surfaces. Basic best management practices (BMPs) for pollution prevention would include monitoring of storage areas exposed to the inclement weather to ensure that pollutants are not discharged into storm drainages during construction and operation of the facility. These measures would ensure the protection of water resources thereby minimizing the impacts to water resources. Additionally, under the new Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) requirements, the same BMPs would address pollution of water from storage areas. All facilities within the food court would meet requirements to ensure that any aboveground storage tanks for oil/grease management are properly managed and they do not discharge into the storm drains. Adherence to the above-mentioned plans and regulations would limit potential adverse effects to surface water to minor adverse effects.

Implementation of the preferred alternative (Alternative 7) would result in adverse impacts to approximately 0.114 acres of wetlands and 26 linear feet of intermittent stream with some perennial streams, permanently converting these areas to improved land. Because of the small amount of wetlands impacted by the Proposed Action, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has allowed AAFES to utilize Nationwide Permit #18 for the construction of the Proposed Action. Furthermore, in
accordance with the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, a 25-foot buffer must be between any development and a defined stream channel. However, because the impacts would be associated with the road crossing for the shopping center project the Proposed Action would result in an exemption from this requirement. Although the wetlands are being permanently impacted, because of the small amount and the ability to utilize the Nationwide Permit, these impacts would be considered minor adverse impacts. No effect would occur to either groundwater resources or floodplains from the implementation of the preferred alternative.

**Noise.** The preferred site of the proposed action is located within Zone I, where noise sensitive receptors (i.e., housing, schools, and medical facilities) are compatible with the noise environment (Figure 2-2). Construction and land-disturbing activities would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels at and around the construction site. Noise generators during construction include vehicles and equipment involved in site clearing and grading, construction, landscaping, and finishing work. Short-term noise impacts would continue for approximately 20 months from the commencement of site work to the end of construction activities. Also, there would be an increase in vehicular traffic noise due to the increase in visits by construction vehicles per day. Impacts can be minimized by limiting construction activity to daylight hours and by using properly maintained and muffled equipment. Noise associated with implementation of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would be limited primarily to construction and would represent a localized short-term minor adverse effect and would not affect any noise sensitive receptors located greater than 50 feet away from the preferred alternative site.

Noise from operation of the new shopping center would be limited primarily to an increase in the number of vehicles in the area, including delivery trucks and patron traffic. Compared to existing noise levels, the noise levels from increased traffic activity would be expected to add a minimal increase to existing ambient noise levels within the project area, resulting in a long-term minor adverse effect. This long-term minor adverse effect would not result in incompatible noise activities to sensitive noise receptors located within Zone 1.

**Air Quality.** Long-term impacts to the immediate project area would occur from emissions due to an increase in deliveries and customer vehicular traffic. However, it is anticipated, that overall regional emissions associated with vehicular traffic would remain the same. Therefore, there would be no significant long-term impacts to air quality associated with the preferred alternative.

The operation of heavy equipment would have minor, temporary negative impacts on air quality during the construction phase. These impacts would be primarily in the form of increased exhaust pollutants, which can be minimized by good vehicle maintenance. Windblown soil and dust may also occur during the construction phase as a result of equipment movement over exposed soil areas. Appendix D provides additional data on air quality impacts. Fugitive dust can be greatly minimized by appropriate dust control measures such as wetting the surfaces and by re-vegetating disturbed areas as soon as possible. Therefore, the short-term air quality impacts resulting from the Proposed Action would be a temporary increase of air pollutants during construction, which would cease once the project was completed. No significant adverse impacts would result from the Proposed Action.

**Earth Resources.** A moderate amount of excavation and fill is anticipated within the 18.25 acre disturbed area. Short-term moderate adverse construction impacts may result in an increase in soil erosion resulting in moderate adverse impacts to soils. Any increased exposure of the Nankin soils could result in the formation of gullies and in a large volume of soil runoff. A construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit would be required to ensure that construction activities adhere to BMPs/other measures and would be associated with the ES&PC Plan. Erosion controls and structures for this permit would likely be extensive due to the
quality of soils present. Long-term impact would be dependent on the increase in exposure of the Nankin soils. In addition, as indicated previously, AAFES would be required to prepare and implement a SPCC Plan during construction activities and management of the facility. These measurements would ensure the protection of soil resources.

Adverse impacts from geologic hazards, including seismic shaking or subsidence, are not likely to affect this project. In addition, no known unique geologic features or mineral resources would be affected.

**Infrastructure and Utilities.** Implementation of the preferred alternative would result in an increase demand upon existing infrastructure and utilities. Existing infrastructure and utility services at Fort Benning have adequate capacity to accommodate the Proposed Action. However, construction of the Proposed Action would increase the volume of traffic slightly in the project area due to on-road use by construction equipment, construction workforce vehicles, and vehicles delivering construction materials. Management actions to minimize impacts from increased traffic have been included in the project design. The increase in traffic following construction is not expected to be large compared to the volume of traffic currently present in the area and is not expected to affect the current levels of service for adjacent roadways and intersections.

**Hazardous Materials and Wastes.** Hazardous materials, including retail-sized containers of motor oil, paints and solvents, would likely be stored at the site during operation of the new shopping center. However, these materials would be stored solely for retail sale and individual, off-site use by military personnel and their families. Any hazardous materials/waste that are accumulated would be managed and disposed of in accordance with all local, State and Federal laws and regulations, and Fort Benning hazardous waste plan to include a site-specific SPCC Plan for the facility. These would also be on-site during the construction phase of the project and must be managed in accordance with Federal and State laws and Fort Benning’s Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Part B Permit. No adverse effects would result from the Proposed Action.

**Biological Resources.** The majority of the species that currently use the area have adapted to living in urban areas and co-existing with human activity, and are mobile generalist species that utilize a variety of interspersed/fragmented habitats, range over wide areas for food and cover, and/or are migratory and would use the site seasonally. No federally or State-protected species are known to exist on or use the preferred site. No adverse effects to habitat, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species would result from the Proposed Action.

Although no foreseen direct impacts would occur, 18.25 acres of potential foraging habitat for the federally endangered red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) would be lost. However, the preferred alternative site is not foraging habitat for any currently active clusters and is located outside the foraging circle of any inactive cluster; therefore, it is unlikely that implementation of the Proposed Action at this site, including removal of 14 RCW trees, would adversely affect the continued existence of the RCW on Fort Benning. These 14 trees are associated with abandoned cluster AA-01, which is inactive and was deleted from management in 1998; therefore, there would be no effect to threatened and endangered species from this alternative. No mitigation measures are proposed.

**Cultural Resources.** Based on the field visit, and past studies conducted within the area of potential effect (APE), it is unlikely that cultural resources would be directly impacted within or near the APE. Once the proposed PX facility is completed, however, Soldiers’ Support Services, which is currently located within a group of World War II-era structures would be relocated to the vacated, existing PX facility (Holloway 2000). Once Soldiers’ Support Services moves, the old structures formerly used by Soldiers’ Support Services would be demolished (Holloway 2000), which would be considered an adverse effect of the project. The demolition of these structures would be covered
under the 1986 Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (USDOD 1986). Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would have no affect on any resources eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The State Historic Preservation Officer concurs with this assessment as presented in the concurrence letter provided in Appendix B. No mitigation measures are proposed.

Land Use. The proposed site is currently undeveloped and wooded with more woodlands to the north and east; however, the areas to the west and south are urbanized. The Proposed Action would be contained within Fort Benning, which sets its own land use and zoning designations and would not present conflicts with local or state land use or zoning designations. The proposed site is designated as “family housing” and “open space.” The construction of the proposed PX facility would change the land designation to “community.” No significant adverse impacts are anticipated from this Proposed Action, and use of the proposed site would be compatible with surrounding land uses.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE: The conditions and characteristics anticipated under the no-action alternative for each of the resources at Fort Benning would continue at levels equal to those occurring under the existing condition. No significant impacts are experienced or generated by the existing condition because infrastructure can accommodate the current levels of activity. However, future levels of activity could exceed infrastructure capacity. No significant impacts would be expected for the no-action alternative.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>(United States) Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>(United States) Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPRC</td>
<td>Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPTTR</td>
<td>Digital Multi-Purpose Training Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Directorate of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRMO</td>
<td>Defense Reutilization Marketing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS/GS</td>
<td>Direct Support/General Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>environmental assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Environmental Data Resources, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>(United States) Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES&amp;PC Plan</td>
<td>Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint EMC</td>
<td>Flint Electrical Membership Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Army Forces Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA DNR</td>
<td>Georgia Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA EPD</td>
<td>Georgia Environmental Protection Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA HPD</td>
<td>Georgia Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>geographic information system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpm</td>
<td>gallons per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWTF</td>
<td>Georgia Wetlands Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hcf</td>
<td>hundred cubic feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>historic properties component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHWMP</td>
<td>Installation Hazardous Waste Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPBC</td>
<td>Infantry Platoon Battle Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBC</td>
<td>Infantry Squad Battle Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCP</td>
<td>Installation Spill Contingency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMU</td>
<td>land management unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTU</td>
<td>1,000 British thermal units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Major Construction, Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgd</td>
<td>million gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRC</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Range Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRF</td>
<td>Materials Recovery Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>metropolitan statistical area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWR</td>
<td>Morale, Welfare, and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAF</td>
<td>non-appropriated fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFI</td>
<td>non-appropriated fund instrumentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGPRA</td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHP</td>
<td>Natural Heritage Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>nitrogen dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>Notice of Termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>nitrogen oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>National Priorities List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetlands Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td>polychlorinated biphenyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCi/L</td>
<td>picoCuries per liter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>Public and Stakeholder Involvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂·₅</td>
<td>particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMOA</td>
<td>Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>parts per billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>Prevention of Significant Deterioration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PX</td>
<td>Post Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>red-cockaded woodpecker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Record of Environmental Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>region of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>sulfur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC Plan</td>
<td>Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Terrain Analysis Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMDL</td>
<td>total maximum daily load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpy</td>
<td>tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADOC</td>
<td>Training and Doctrine Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>transportation-storage-disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAIC</td>
<td>United States Army Infantry Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>United States Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>volatile organic compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP</td>
<td>wastewater treatment plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

This environmental assessment (EA) identifies, describes, and evaluates the potential impacts to the environment as a result of the proposed construction of a commercial building with the intent of consolidating multiple businesses in one location at Fort Benning, Muscogee County, Georgia (also referred to herein as the “Post”). This report also identifies the required environmental permits relevant to the Proposed Action and identifies actions that could be taken to minimize environmental impacts.


1.1 Organization of the Document

The first three sections of this EA establish the existing conditions at Fort Benning. Section 1 provides a general overview of the purposes for preparing the EA. This section also describes the Proposed Action and explains the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, as well as provides a list of the agency personnel consulted, and a description of the necessary environmental permits and contractor requirements. Section 2 describes the location of the Proposed Action and the methods used to identify the alternatives. In addition, this section describes the no-action alternative and the alternative that best meets the siting criteria. Section 3 establishes the environmental setting at Fort Benning by describing the physical, biological, socioeconomic, and the cultural and archaeological resources on the Post. The characteristics described include, but are not limited to, groundwater, wetlands and other surface waters, vegetation, threatened and endangered species, utility infrastructure, air quality, hazardous waste, land use, and transportation. Section 4 discusses the environmental consequences of the no-action alternative and the preferred alternative. Section 5
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provides a discussion of projects occurring both on Fort Benning and in the Columbus area and discusses potential cumulative impacts. Section 6 provides the findings and conclusions of this EA. Section 7 provides a list of persons who prepared this document and Section 8 lists the references used to develop this EA. Appendix A provides the wetlands jurisdictional delineation, Appendix B contains cultural resources and protected species information, and Appendix C is the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Nationwide Permit. Appendix D contains the air quality analysis tables.

1.2 Description of the Proposed Action

The Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES)\(^1\) proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a new shopping center at an undeveloped site on Fort Benning for use by authorized individuals. The Proposed Action would consist of the construction, operation, and maintenance of a shopping center containing a main store, military clothing sales store, and a food court including an Anthony’s Pizza, Robin Hood Deli, Burger King, Taco Bell, Church’s Chicken, Manchu Wok, Charley’s Grilled Subs, A & W, and Baskin Robbins. Services would include a barber shop, beauty shop, pharmacy, alterations shop, optometrist/eyecare office, flower shop, one-hour photo store, nutrition center, shoe store, amusement arcade, beauty supply, collectibles, roving concessions, category enhancer, and local artisan. Recycled content products would be supplied in the Post Exchange (PX) for purchase by consumers.

New construction would consist of reinforced concrete slab/foundation with masonry/metal stud exterior walls, steel structure and built-up partitions, AAFES-provided shelving, suspended ceilings, and recessed energy-efficient lighting. Construction products would meet United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recycled content requirements. Exterior support would include required utilities, communications, paving, walks, curbs, storm drainage, site improvements, electrical, mechanical, and fire protection for a complete and usable facility. Prior to construction, the Fort Benning Land Management Branch would remove all merchantable timber. Only AAFES-authorized patrons would use the facility. These patrons primarily include active-duty and retired military personnel, their family members, and certain categories of reserve military personnel.

Once the proposed PX facility is completed, Soldiers’ Support Services would be relocated to the vacated, existing PX facility (Holloway 2000). Soldiers’ Support Services is currently located in a

\(^1\) The Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) is a non-appropriated fund instrumentality (NAFI) organized as a joint command of the Army and Air Force under the United States Department of Defense. AAFES was established more than 100 years ago. Its mission is to provide quality merchandise and services at uniformly low prices to active duty military, National Guard and Reserve members, military retirees, and family members. One hundred percent (100%) of the earnings of the AAFES are returned to the Army and the Air Force to provide funding for quality of life programs for service members and their families. AAFES operates more than 10,500 facilities worldwide, including 1,423 retail facilities and 200 military clothing stores.
group of World War II-era structures within an older part of the Post. Once Soldiers’ Support Services moves, the old structures formerly used by Soldiers’ Support Services would be demolished (Holloway 2000).

1.3 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to better serve the needs of the military community through the improvement of shopping facilities on Fort Benning. The existing PX facility was built in 1973 and is part of the PX and commissary complex, which is 95,000 square feet and includes a gas station, parking lots, and other services. The PX and commissary complex facility is located on a site bounded by Marne Road to the north, Interstate 185 (I-185) to the west, Hamlet Creek to the north, and undeveloped property to the east and south (Figure 2-2).

Currently, the PX is located in a confined space adjacent to the commissary, is highly congested, and too small to adequately serve the customer base. All AAFES food stores require substantial upgrades to meet the current retail standards AAFES requires at its newer facilities. Mechanical equipment is antiquated and the roof routinely leaks. To meet current AAFES retail standards, AAFES proposes to construct a new shopping center to solve the sizing, overcrowding, and maintenance problems, while maintaining easy access and locating the facility near the existing commissary and other associated services.

1.4 Scope of the Environmental Review

This EA identifies, describes, and evaluates the potential environmental impacts that could result from implementing the Proposed Action or alternatives, taking into consideration possible cumulative impacts from other actions underway or planned at Fort Benning. Required environmental permits relevant to the Proposed Action or alternatives are identified, and mitigation measures and management actions that could minimize environmental impacts are described. The following topics were identified for study at Fort Benning: noise, air quality, earth resources, water resources, infrastructure and utilities, hazardous materials and waste, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and land use.

The Army has proposed other actions at Fort Benning concurrent with the Proposed Action. The environmental impacts of these other actions have been analyzed and are addressed in this EA only in the context of potential cumulative impacts, if any. A cumulative impact, as defined by the CEQ (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.7), is the “impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably
foreseeable future actions regardless of which agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.”

1.5 Agency Coordination and Public Participation

In accordance with the NEPA of 1969 and AR 200-2, a Public and Stakeholder Involvement Plan (PIP) was drafted and is available upon request. The EA and draft Finding of No Significant Impact will be made available for agency and public review during a 30-day review period. The EA and draft Finding of No Significant Impact will be placed on the Fort Benning website for a period of 30 days for comments to be received. Comments may be submitted via the website to Fort Benning.
2 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 Location of the Proposed Action

Fort Benning, Georgia (Figure 2-1), occupies approximately 184,000 acres of land, of which approximately 172,400 acres are located in Georgia and 11,600 acres are located in Alabama. The Post is located in the lower Piedmont Region of central Georgia and Alabama, predominantly within Chattahoochee, Muscogee, and Marion Counties in Georgia and partially within Russell County, Alabama. This project is located in Chattahoochee County.

2.2 Alternatives Development Process

NEPA and 32 CFR Part 651 require the consideration of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. Although a large amount of development exists on Fort Benning, several large undeveloped areas dedicated to training activities remain throughout the Post. In an attempt to minimize the impact on existing training activities and future projects, both Fort Benning and AAFES staff evaluated several feasible sites and site designs against initial concerns and general site selection criteria to determine the most viable and reasonable alternative locations and site designs. Proposed sites were identified according to the size of the parcel and the ability to meet the requirements of the purpose and need.

Site Selection Criteria

The following criteria were developed based upon the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, as well as other land use and environmental factors:

- Located near I-185 to be convenient to customers, in an area of heavy traffic flow and high visibility;
- Located near a main entrance into Fort Benning;
- Consistent with AAFES mission activities;
Figure 2-1
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- Located near existing commissary and services;
- Located near family housing areas;
- Minimal environmental constraints;
- Provides adequate space for the new uses; and
- Has adequate availability of utilities.

Table 2-1
Evaluation of Alternatives Based on Site Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt.</th>
<th>Near I-185</th>
<th>Near Main Gate</th>
<th>Consistent with AAFES Mission Activities</th>
<th>Near Existing Commissary</th>
<th>Near Family Housing</th>
<th>Adequate Space</th>
<th>Consistent with Military Activities</th>
<th>Minimal Environmental Constraints</th>
<th>Adequate Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
✓ = Criterion met
X = Criterion not met.

2.3 Alternative Sites Considered, but Eliminated from Further Review

Alternatives 1 through 6 were eliminated from further detailed review after preliminary analysis deemed that each of these alternative sites do not comply with the general siting criteria or the requirements of the purpose and need. Each of the six eliminated alternative sites are briefly described below. Alternative 7 (the preferred alternative) meets all of the proposed site evaluation criteria and will be evaluated along with the no-action alternative (Alternative 8), beginning in Section 2.4 of this EA.

2.3.1 Alternative 1

This proposed alternative site is bounded by Marne Road to the south, Lindsay Creek Parkway to the west, Hamlet Creek to the north, and undeveloped forested areas to the north and east (Figure 2-2). The existing land use is Commercial. The site is directly north of Marne Road from the existing facility, commissary, and gas station. The nearest family housing is located approximately...
0.75 mile to the southwest, across Lindsay Creek Parkway. The nearest access control point entrance gate is approximately 2 miles to the north/northwest on Lindsay Creek Parkway.

Alternative 1 meets all but one of the evaluation criteria for the siting of the Proposed Action. Environmental constraints associated with the implementation of this alternative would be greater than other alternatives. These include the long-term conversion of 45 acres of undeveloped land to a shopping mall facility. Furthermore, wetland delineations concluded that 3.44 acres of wetlands exist on this alternative site, of which 1.80 acres would be impacted, requiring a Section 404 permit from the USACE. Additionally, a total of 1,171 linear feet of intermittent stream would be impacted by the Proposed Action under this alternative. In accordance with the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, a 25-foot buffer must be between any development and a defined stream channel. Impacts to an intermittent stream would require a variance, which the State of Georgia is not approving (Fisher 2003). Variances are only allowed for road construction activities that do not impact the flow of the stream; therefore, because no variances are provided for this type of construction, the project is considered not possible to construct. Even if variances were granted for this project, the costs of mitigation would be extensive, totaling approximately $77,000 (Fisher 2003). Furthermore, because of the grade changes on the site, earth-moving activities would be required bringing in approximately 25,000 cubic yards of fill. Costs associated with these impacts would substantially increase the costs of the project to AAFES. For these reasons, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration in subsequent analyses; however, through the alternatives development process, this alternative has been modified to minimize overall impacts and is presented throughout this EA as Alternative 7 (preferred alternative).

2.3.2 Alternative 2

This proposed alternative site is located on the northeast side of First Division Road, east of the golf course, and near Outpost Number 2 (Figure 2-2). The site is approximately 82 acres. The existing and proposed land use for the site is Outdoor Recreation and Open Space. If the Proposed Action was sited at this location, land use would change to Community Facilities. The site is currently undeveloped and contains vegetation/trees.

Alternative 2 meets six of the land use and environmental criteria for the siting of the proposed facility; however, this proposed site is too great a distance from I-185 (approximately 4.1 miles), from the main gate (3.2 miles), and from the existing commissary (1.6 miles). For these reasons, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration in subsequent analyses.
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2.3.3 Alternative 3

This proposed alternative site is approximately 112 acres located on the north side of First Division Road and east of Santa Fe Road (Figure 2-2). The existing land use for the site is Open Space; proposed future land use is Family Housing. If the Proposed Action was sited at this location, land use would change to Community Facilities. The site is currently undeveloped and contains vegetation/trees.

Alternative 3 meets seven of the land use and environmental criteria for the siting of the proposed facility. This proposed site, however, is located approximately 2.7 miles from the main gate and 0.2 miles from the existing commissary. For these reasons, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration in subsequent analyses.

2.3.4 Alternative 4

Proposed Alternative 4 is located to the south of Victory Drive, west of I-185, and east of Santa Fe Road, near Lloyd Elementary School (Figure 2-2). The site is approximately 62 acres. The existing and proposed future land use for the site is Outdoor Recreation. If the proposed facility was sited at this location, land use would change to Community Facilities. The site is currently undeveloped and contains vegetation/trees.

Alternative 4 meets six of the land use and environmental criteria for siting of the proposed facility; however, the site is located approximately 2.7 miles from the existing commissary. This site is distant from existing Fort Benning utilities (e.g., sanitary sewer), but could be tied into the City of Columbus’s utility systems. For this reason, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration in subsequent analyses.

2.3.5 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 consists of expanding the existing 95,000-square foot PX facility. The PX and existing commissary complex is located on a site bounded by Marne Road to the north, I-185 to the west, Hamlet Creek to the north, and undeveloped property to the east and south (Figure 2-2). The existing facility was built in 1973 and is part of the PX and commissary complex, which includes a gas station, parking lots, and other services. Additional parking would be added to the east of Hamlet Creek and would be connected to the proposed facility via a pedestrian bridge. Construction of the Proposed Action at this alternative site would conform to all applicable building and utility codes, including the 1997 Unified Building Code (Beachler 2000).
Alternative 5 meets eight of the nine site-selection criteria. The site proposes some environmental constraints. In general, the site is flat in disturbed areas, but slopes slightly to the east and south near the undisturbed areas at the eastern and southern edges of the property. Correction of these slopes would require the placement of significant amounts of fill. Furthermore, the site would require the placement of a retaining wall to support the new fill. Contractor estimates indicated that the design and construction of this retaining wall would cost approximately $8 million dollars. For these reasons, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration in subsequent analyses.

2.3.6 Alternative 6

The Alternative 6 site is located on the south side of First Division Road (Figure 2-2). This proposed site is approximately 19.8 acres. The existing land use for the site is Ranges/Training; proposed land use is the same. The site is currently undeveloped and contains some vegetation/trees. The site was once a borrow pit, evidenced by the bulk area being devoid of trees.

Alternative 6 meets six of the nine evaluation criteria; however, this site would not provide adequate space or utilities and location of the facility at this site would not be consistent with military training activities. Siting at this location would restrict future range requirements and would require the hardening and possible relocation of the tank trail located south of this site. Safety and noise concerns would arise because of the proximity of the site to the Pierce and Red Cloud Ranges. For these reasons, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration in subsequent analyses.

2.4 Actions to be Evaluated Further in the EA

2.4.1 Alternative 7: (Preferred Alternative Site)

The preferred alternative site is the same as the Alternative 1 site location (Figure 2-2), however, due to the environmental constraints presented by Alternative 1, AAFES redesigned the facility and reduced the footprint of the construction activity to minimize the environmental constraints, resulting in Alternative 7. The facilities and services that would be provided under Alternative 7 are as described in Section 1.2 “Description of the Proposed Action.” Alternative 7 is the only alternative that meets all of the site selection criteria.

This site is currently undeveloped with no known previous development. The site primarily consists of mature mixed hardwood pine forest and grassland. Prior to construction, the Fort Benning Land Management Branch will remove all merchantable timber. It is generally flat at the plateau in the center and slopes out in a radial fashion at the edges of the area to be developed. Two unnamed
tributaries flow to the north on the eastern and western sides of the central plateau and feed into Hamlet Creek.

Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site location would last approximately 20 months. The total disturbed area proposed for the site activities would be approximately 18.25 acres, including an approximately 218,000-square foot building. A conceptual site plan for the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site is shown on Figure 2-3. Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would conform to all applicable building and utility codes, including the 1997 Unified Building Code (Beachler 2000). Since the funding is non-appropriated, the Spirit design standards, which are Army standard design guidelines would not need to be followed. However, where appropriate, AAFES will incorporate these design standards into the construction of the new shopping center.

2.4.2 Alternative 8: The No-Action Alternative (Status Quo)

Under Alternative 8, the no-action alternative (status quo), a new shopping facility would not be built on the Post. The military community that shops at Fort Benning would continue to use the existing facility that is limited in space and offers an unsatisfactory range of services and merchandise. Without the construction of a new, modern shopping center, the military community could increasingly be forced to shop at commercial establishments located off the Post. This would be both inefficient and inconvenient for active military personnel, their families, and other shoppers eligible to shop in the PX.
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Figure 2-3
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This section describes the existing natural and human environment on Fort Benning that may be impacted by the implementation of the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative. The location of the proposed AAFES shopping center under Alternative 7 and the location of Alternative 8 (No-Action Alternative) are within close proximity of each other, basically across the street from one another (Figure 2-1). Therefore, the affected environment would be the same under implementation of either of these alternatives.

### 3.1 Post Location and History

Fort Benning is located in the lower Piedmont Region of central Georgia and Alabama, predominately within Chattahoochee County, Georgia. Portions of the Post are in Muscogee County, Georgia, with the western segment extending into Russell County, Alabama (Figure 2-1). The Post is approximately 100 miles south-southwest of Atlanta, Georgia, 6 miles southeast of Columbus, Georgia, and consists of approximately 182,000 acres of river valley terraces and rolling terrain. The Chattahoochee River flows through the southern portion of the Post (Figure 2-1).

Fort Benning was established in 1918 to train much-needed infantry troops to fight in Europe during World War I, and became known as “Home of the Infantry.” The U.S. Army Infantry School was established at Fort Benning, and has gradually emerged as the most influential infantry center in the modern world. From 1918 until the present, the development of Fort Benning has been directly proportional to the progress of the infantry school (Fort Benning 2003a). Fort Benning has three basic training missions: (1) to conduct Basic Training for new Infantry and non-branch specific recruits, conduct Infantry, Airborne, and Ranger training for officers and enlisted personnel, and operate a non-branch-specific Officer Candidate School; (2) to study the doctrine, rationale, equipment, and future of infantry combat; and (3) to provide a home station and deployment facility for Forces Command (FORSCOM) and Special Operations Command (SOCOM) units. Fort Benning has carried out this mission through two World Wars and a number of other military conflicts. Presently, five
types of infantry, including mechanized, light, airborne, air assault, and ranger infantry, train at Fort Benning (United States Department of the Army [Army] 2001).

3.2 Socioeconomic Resources

The Columbus, Georgia Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) consists of Muscogee, Harris, and Chattahoochee Counties in Georgia, as well as Russell County, Alabama, and encompasses a total of approximately 4,125 square miles.

3.2.1 Demographics

As of September 30, 2000, approximately 114,293 total persons were at Fort Benning. This figure includes on-Post troops, reserves, visitors, and Allied Military personnel and students (31,466), civilians (7,080), retirees (13,542), dependents of active, retired, and deceased personnel (55,566), and satellite personnel (6,639; Jackson 2000). Some personnel included in these figures may actually be assigned and deployed elsewhere in support of Fort Benning. Also, approximately 3,950 families are housed on-Post, while approximately 6,609 families are housed off-Post (Jackson 2000). Only authorized personnel and their dependents are allowed to use the services provided by the existing shopping center facility; these authorized users comprise approximately 4,300 customers daily (Taylor 2000a).

3.2.2 Economy, Employment, and Income

Columbus is Georgia’s third largest city and is the center of commerce for a 26-county trade area of west-central Georgia and east-central Alabama. Four counties comprise the central MSA for the City of Columbus include: Muscogee, Harris, and Chattahoochee Counties in Georgia and Russell County in Alabama. The Columbus MSA contains over 4.5 million square feet of developed retail space and continues to attract new development, show growth in sales, and a growing customer base.

Fort Benning provides a significant economic impact to the Columbus MSA through military and civilian payroll and the purchase of goods and services. The existing PX facility has a customer base that includes: 23,305 active duty personnel with 22,076 dependents; 11,126 retiree sponsors with 18,997 dependents; 4,261 reserve and guard sponsors; and 6,096 dependents, for a total of 85,861 potential customers. Approximately 4,300 customers utilize the existing PX facility on a daily basis, and facility has 129 employees (90 military; 34 civilian; and five active military; Taylor 2000a).
3.3 Water Resources

3.3.1 Surface Water

The Chattahoochee River is the dominant surface water feature at Fort Benning. The Chattahoochee River, in conjunction with the Flint River to the east, is a major component of the Apalachicola River drainage basin of eastern Alabama, western Georgia, and the Florida Panhandle. Numerous oxbows, abandoned meander channels, isolated ponds, and wetland areas are located along the river. Principal tributaries on the Post that lead to the Chattahoochee include Bull Creek and Upatoi Creek, each of which has several lesser tributaries flowing into them. The preferred site for the Proposed Action (Alternative 7) is located between two unnamed tributaries that flow north and discharge to Hamlet Creek, which is located outside the project limits. Hamlet Creek flows to the northwest approximately 0.5 miles to Upatoi Creek. Upatoi Creek flows approximately 2.5 miles to the southwest to the Chattahoochee River.

Water Quality

Total maximum daily load (TMDL) is defined as the amount of a particular pollutant that a water body (stream or water segment, lake, or estuary) can receive and still meet its beneficial use designation and State water quality standards for that pollutant. TMDLs are developed for all water bodies identified as not meeting water quality standards and for which there are no ongoing actions to resolve the impairment.

The State of Georgia has identified 31 stream segments in the Chattahoochee River Basin as “water quality limited” (i.e., Clean Water Act, Section 303[d] listed) or impaired due to sedimentation. The “Biota Impacted” designation is given when studies show a modification of the biological community, primarily due to sediment problems. There are no impaired streams located on or adjacent to the preferred alternative site.

3.3.2 Groundwater

The state of Georgia possesses the largest amount and highest quality groundwater aquifers in the world. Fort Benning is located in the Coastal Plain hydrogeologic province of Georgia and Alabama, whose principal groundwater source is the Cretaceous aquifer system. The recharge area for these aquifers is the Sand Hills area, which includes Fort Benning (Georgia Department of Natural Resources [GA DNR] 1986).

The Georgia Geologic Survey identifies the Cretaceous aquifers in the Fort Benning area as the A-3 through A-6 aquifers. The confining strata above and below the aquifers are designated C-3, C-4, and C-5. Aquifer A-6 is part of the upper Tuscaloosa and the overlying Lower Eutaw
Formations. This aquifer typically yields approximately 50 gallons per minute (gpm) near the Fall Line, but yields approximately 700 gpm near the southern Post boundary. Water from A-6 is usually of good quality.

Aquifer A-5 is part of the basal sedimentary sequence of the Blufftown Formation. The A-5 water is more acidic than A-6. Some sedimentary lenses of the A-5 aquifer contain gypsum crystals, which result in a high sulfate content. Aquifer A-4 is in the upper sedimentary sequence of the Blufftown Formation, and contains increasing amounts of dissolved solids, sodium, and bicarbonate concentrations. Both A-4 and A-5 aquifers have low yields and are usually combined with other aquifers to produce adequate supplies.

The A-3 aquifer correlates with the Cusseta Sand Formation. Yields from this aquifer range from 1 to 10 gpm in the area surrounding the Post. This aquifer is not considered an individual source aquifer (Pollard and Vorhis 1980).

The Fort Benning Master Planning Office has mapped aquifer recharge areas to consider during the planning process for Master Plan projects. The preferred site for the Proposed Action (Alternative 7) is located within a general recharge area for the Cretaceous aquifer system (Davis et al. 1988).

3.3.3 Floodplains and Wetlands

Executive Order 11988, entitled “Floodplain Management,” requires Federal agencies to take action to minimize development within floodplains. However, because neither the site of the existing PX or the preferred alternative site location are within floodplains, this resource will not be addressed further in this EA.

Gulf Engineers and Consultants completed a mapping overlay of the wetland areas on Fort Benning. These overlays are available at the Fort Benning Directorate of Public Works (DPW) for review. This map was generated from data gleaned from National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps (also available at DPW for review), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service county soil surveys that show soils classified as hydric, color infrared aerial photographs, and the terrain analysis for Fort Benning.

The AAFES contractor prepared a wetlands jurisdictional delineation for the preferred site (Alternative 7) of the Proposed Action (Appendix A). Field surveys confirmed that two wetland areas totaling 0.15 acres are located on the preferred site (see Figure 3-1); however, only 0.114 acres of jurisdictional waters on the Alternative 7 site would be impacted by development activities related to the Proposed Action (Figure 3-1). Some of the areas on the preferred site were considered to be intermittent streams; impacts to these areas are documented by the amount of linear feet impacted.
The project footprint covers 18.25 acres.

26 Linear Feet of Stream Impact and 0.013 Acres of Wetland Impact
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Figure 3-1
Fort Benning Wetland Impacts Associated with the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 7)
Ft. Benning, Georgia
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Approximately 26 linear feet would be impacted by the construction of the facility at the preferred site (Figure 3-1). These areas were delineated using standard survey procedures according to guidelines outlined in the USACE Wetland Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987). Each area is addressed below (also see Appendix A; Figure 3-1).

- **Area A.** This jurisdictional feature is 0.11 acres in size and is located on the eastern side of the ridge proposed for development. All of Area A would be impacted by the proposed development activities.

- **Area B.** This jurisdictional feature is 0.04 acres in size and is located on the western side of the ridge proposed for development. A total of 0.004 acres of Area B would be impacted by the proposed development activities.

The wetland impacts associated with the implementation of Alternative 7 were substantially decreased from the original design. The redesign reduced the overall footprint of the facility from 45 acres to approximately 18.25 acres and substantially reduced the size of the parking areas. As a result of these design modifications, the potential impacts to wetlands areas have been minimized.

### 3.4 Noise

Noise-sensitive receptors of activities related to the implementation of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site include Martin Army Community Hospital (approximately 890 feet from construction area), nearby family housing and/or barracks (Northeast Family Housing approximately 305 feet and Southwest Family Housing is approximately 1,190 feet from the construction area), schools (Faith Middle School), and recreation areas (i.e., athletic complex, swimming pool). Noise contributors would include vehicular traffic associated with the shopping facility and with I-185 and Marne Road, helicopter traffic to and from the hospital (approximately 0.4 miles from the preferred alternative site), sirens from Emergency Medical Service (EMS) units and other emergency response vehicles, artillery and small arms fire from nearby firing ranges, and flight operations at Lawson Army Airfield (approximately 4.8 miles from the preferred alternative site). The nearest training range is the Pierce Range for the TFP Buddy Team, which is approximately 1.3 miles from the preferred alternative site.

Army Regulation 200-1, *Environmental Protection and Enhancement*, defines the requirements for the Army’s Environmental Noise Management Program. Three noise zones (NZ) are defined in the regulation as indicated below and illustrated in Figure 2-2:

- Zone I (compatible): Housing, schools, medical facilities, and other noise sensitive land uses are compatible with noise levels in the zone (all areas not contained within Zone II or Zone III).
• Zone II (normally incompatible): Noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., housing, schools and medical facilities) are normally incompatible with noise levels in this zone unless measures have been taken to attenuate interior noise levels.
• Zone III (incompatible): Noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., housing, schools, medical facilities) are incompatible in this zone.

3.5 Air Quality

3.5.1 National Ambient Air Quality Standards

The Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970, 42 United States Code (USC) 7401 et seq., amended in 1977 and 1990, is the primary Federal statute governing air pollution. The CAA designates six pollutants as criteria pollutants, for which National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) have been promulgated to protect public health and welfare. The six criteria pollutants are particulate matter, \( \text{PM}_{10} \) and \( \text{PM}_{2.5} \), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO\(_2\)), nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), lead (Pb), and ozone (O\(_3\)). Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are not considered criteria pollutants, but emissions of VOCs are linked to ozone concentrations.

In addition, Federal law requires states or local air quality control agencies to establish a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that prescribes measures to achieve or maintain attainment of these standards. Areas that do not meet NAAQSs are designated as "non-attainment" for that criteria pollutant. The GA DNR’s Environmental Protection Division (GA EPD) manages air quality for the state of Georgia.

The northern portion of Fort Benning is located in Muscogee County and the southern portion, including the Proposed Action site and each alternative site, is located in Chattahoochee County. Muscogee County, Georgia, and Russell County, Alabama, were initially designated by the U.S. EPA as nonattainment for PM\(_{2.5}\) (material primarily formed from chemical reactions in the atmosphere and through fuel combustion such as motor vehicles, power generation, industrial facilities, residential fire places, wood stoves and agricultural burning [MOE 2004]) as part of the Columbus MSA. However, the U.S. EPA published a Supplemental Notice regarding designation in the Federal Register on April 5, 2005, that revised the Columbus MSA designation to “in attainment” for PM\(_{2.5}\) (Gustafson 2005; Veenstra 2005). Therefore, there are currently no additional requirements on this proposed project due to air attainment status.

3.5.2 Air Emissions

Fugitive dust is particulate emissions released from sources that do not have a pinpoint exit such as a stack or vent. Examples are an uncovered truck bed, or train car, or emissions caused by vehicles traveling over an unpaved road. A letter from Harold Reheis, GA EPD, April 2003, gives
relief during military training and exercises, but not for other activities such as construction. Fugitive
dust is of concern during the construction phase of the project. The Georgia Rule for Air Quality
(391-3-1.02[2][n]) suggests several ways to mitigate for fugitive dust for activities not related to
military training. Fort Benning’s Title V Permit contains sections on particulate emissions and visible
emissions. The Title V Permit includes Particulate Emissions requirements from GA Rules for Air
Quality 391-3-1.02(2)(e) Particulate Emissions for Manufacturing Processes.

The General Conformity Rule has been promulgated by EPA to ensure that the actions of
Federal departments or agencies conform to the applicable SIP. The General Conformity Rule covers
direct and indirect emissions of criteria pollutants or their precursors that are caused by a Federal
action. Conformity evaluations are not required for areas that are “in attainment” for NAAQS. The
CAA also requires states to implement a Title V permitting program, which is enforced in Georgia by
the GA EPD. Fort Benning was issued a Title V permit effective June 13, 2003 (#9711-215-0021-V-
01-0), that provides limits for various source emissions. This permit contains conditions for several
boilers, test cell operations, fuel tanks, paint booths, and other various emissions sources.

A Risk Management Plan for a worst-case scenario of a chlorine release from Fort Benning’s
water treatment plant indicated the Proposed Action site would be impacted since it is located within,
although on the fringe of, a 1.3-mile impact circle. The water treatment plant is located approximately
1.2 miles west of the Proposed Action site (Gustafson 2000a).

A radon gas survey was not performed at the Alternative 7 site as part of this EA. However,
the EPA Map of Radon Zones and the Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Report indicate the
project area is in an area of low potential. Furthermore, in 1993 Fort Benning hired Vail Research and
Technology Corporation to conduct radon monitoring for the Army Radon Reduction Program
(ARRP). Only three of the 2,681 Alpha Track Monitors resulted in readings above 4 picocuries per
liter (pCi/L). Two of the three readings were from “spike detectors.” The third had a reading of 7.3
pCi/L. A memorandum dated March 18, 1993, stated that because only one of the tested Alpha Track
Monitors resulted in a level above the original threshold and that all results were overwhelmingly
below the revised level (of 4 pCi/L), it was recommended that the Fort Benning ARRP be closed with
no further action required. Fort Benning requested that EPA release them from further testing. EPA
never responded, therefore, the Post ceased any further testing (Gustafson 2000b).
3.6 Earth Resources

3.6.1 Geology

Fort Benning lies within the Fall Line, which extends approximately from central Alabama to southern New York and serves as a linear transition zone between the higher Piedmont Physiographic province to the north and west and lower Coastal Plain physiographic province to the south and east. The Fall Line Hills are characterized by fairly deep valleys forming a valley, ridge, and plateau system ranging in altitude from 100 to 200 feet above sea level (ASL). These hills define the rim of the Chattahoochee basin. The Fall Line Hills elevation within Fort Benning ranges from 190 to 735 feet ASL. Two land-form types make up the Post: low plains and high plains. The low plains are defined as flat to gently rolling in floodplain areas and gently to moderately rolling elsewhere (Herrick and Vorhis 1963).

The preferred site of the Proposed Action (Alternative 7) is situated at the juncture of the Eutaw and Blufftown Formations. The Eutaw Formation predominates in the form of short, steep outcrops along the streams draining into Upatoi Creek. This Formation consists of a basal course sand overlain by a dark gray, soft siltstone or shale that is interbedded with fine white sand. Gully erosion can be severe in this area especially if slopes are modified and vegetation is removed. Conversely, the Blufftown Formation exists on higher elevations and to the south of the preferred site of the Proposed Action. This formation consists of alternating beds of sand and sandy clay overlying cross-bedded coarse sand (USDA 1997). No rock outcrops were observed on the preferred site of the Proposed Action.

3.6.2 Soils

The Alternative 7 (preferred) site is subdivided into two distinct soil classifications. Soils in the northern half of the preferred site fall within the general classification of Troup-Cowarts-Nankin with the predominant soil on site being Nankin Sandy Clay Loam. Soils covering the southern half of the preferred site are Ruston Sand. The site consists predominantly of Ruston Sand and a small amount of Ruston Sandy Loam (at the eastern corner of the facility; Fort Benning Land Management Branch 2000). Ruston series soils consist of very deep, well-drained, moderately permeable soils. On the preferred alternative site, they are comprised of a surface layer of loose to firm, fine to medium sand overlaying a loose to very dense, fine to coarse sand. These sand layers are from 10 to 20 feet deep (Hill-Staton Engineers 1999). Groundwater depth in the area is from 11 to 14 feet below existing ground surface, as determined by soil borings (Hill-Staton Engineers 1999). Additional soils data can be obtained from the soil survey (USDA 1997).
3.7 Infrastructure/Utilities

This section evaluates the demand and distribution methods for infrastructure and utility systems on Fort Benning. It should be noted that the Fort Benning water treatment and supply facilities have been privatized to Columbus Water Works. Under this agreement, Fort Benning retains ownership of the underlying lands; however, the ownership, operation, and maintenance of the buildings, systems, and associated water and wastewater facilities is the responsibility of Columbus Water Works.

3.7.1 Stormwater Drainage

Stormwater discharge in the Main Post districts of Fort Benning drain directly into the Chattahoochee River through a system of drain pipes. Other stormwater drain systems on the Post include the Harmony Church area, which drains into Mill Creek and Harps Pond; the Sand Hill area, which drains into Upatoi Creek; and the training compartments, which drain directly or indirectly into Upatoi Creek, Uchee Creek, and/or the Chattahoochee River. Fort Benning maintains a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that establishes best management practices (BMPs) for controlling and preventing siltation and other contaminants associated with construction and industrial activity sites from reaching Fort Benning and surrounding area surface waters.

3.7.2 Potable Water

As of October 2004, Columbus Water Works is the owner and operator of the water and wastewater systems at Fort Benning. Fort Benning’s raw water source is Upatoi Creek. The withdrawal permit associated with the drinking water treatment plant is limited to 12 million gallons per day (mgd) and an average monthly withdrawal of 10 mgd. Upatoi Creek flow data indicates that the minimum flow during the dry season is 121 mgd for the month of October. Therefore, it is determined that Fort Benning’s use totals only approximately 10% of the recorded low flows for Upatoi Creek.

Raw water is pretreated with chlorine dioxide, alum and lime for coagulation, phosphate, and fluoride. Fort Benning has the capacity to meet current and projected future water demands. Total water reserves for the Post are approximately two days (Wilkens 2000). Treated water is distributed throughout Main Post, Kelley Hill, Sand Hill, Harmony Church, and housing areas via a network of lines ranging in diameter from 3 to 20 inches.
3.7.3 **Wastewater and Water Reclamation**

As of October 2004, Columbus Water Works owns and operates the two wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) that serve the entire Post with a combined capacity of 16 mgd. One WWTP is a filter sedimentation plant. The second WWTP has an average monthly capacity of 10,000 mgd. Current demand is approximately 7.5 mgd. Demand increases during the summer months to approximately 8 to 10 mgd. Approximately 95,000 gallons per month of anaerobically digested sewage sludge is land applied at ten locations on the Post.

Both WWTPs discharge to the Chattahoochee River and operate under one National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by GA DNR. The NPDES permit establishes wastewater pollutant limits allowed for release to the environment.

3.7.4 **Solid Waste Management**

Fort Benning generates un-compacted solid waste at an estimated rate of 1,200 to 1,500 tons per month. The Post does not have a permitted sanitary landfill in operation. Currently, all Fort Benning sanitary waste is transported to a state-permitted facility located off the Post. Three approved inert landfills are on the Post; however, only one is currently in operation. These landfills are designed to accept only inert materials, such as fallen limbs and trees, concrete (free of lead-based paint), and cured asphalt. In addition, several closed landfills are located on the Post; however, none are near the Proposed Action site or any of the alternative sites.

Recycling reduces disposal cost, conserves natural resources and minimizes environmental problems associated with land disposal. Fort Benning’s policy on recycling is governed by the June 11, 2003, Policy Memorandum 200-1-8, entitled “Qualified Recycling Program.” Under this policy, recyclable materials generated by contractors must be turned in to the Post Defense Reutilization Marketing Office (DRMO) and the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) for processing.

3.7.5 **Transportation Systems**

Fort Benning is served by several major thoroughfares including I-185 leading from the City of Columbus, U.S. Highway 27/280, which runs east/west, and Fort Benning Road located west of I-185. Primary highway access to Fort Benning is via I-185 from the north near its intersection with Highway 27/280.

A network of primary and secondary roads provides access to and from the Alternative 7 site via Marne Road from the west, and Dixie Road, 1st Calvary Division Road, and First Division Road from the south and southwest. Traffic congestion in the area of the Alternative 7 site is minor and primarily associated with hospital and consumer traffic.
Traffic conditions on Fort Benning have been impacted by the events of September 11, 2001. For instance, until recently, Fort Benning has been an “open post.” The events of September 11, 2001, resulted in a high level of security for the Post and access was limited. The number of entry points into the Post was limited and plans are underway for permanent structures (i.e., traffic islands, fences, gates, and guard houses at seven existing entry points). Portions of the Post are considered off-limits and are gated or secured in some manner.

3.7.6 Public and Occupational Health and Safety

Police and security services at Fort Benning are provided on a 24-hour basis by both military police and civilian personnel. Four fire stations serve Fort Benning, including an aircraft and helicopter crash rescue unit. Emergency services are provided through Martin Army Hospital (Fort Benning 2003a). A fire reporting communications system is operated by the Fort Benning Fire Department. An E-911 (enhanced) public emergency reporting system is in place for the Fort Benning/Columbus area. This system allows emergency responders to immediately locate the origin of any emergency call received by the control center.

Public safety would also be a concern during the construction of the shopping center. Appropriate measures would be enacted to limit unauthorized persons from accessing the construction site. In addition, because construction of the shopping center would require the use of heavy machinery which involves safety risks to personnel working and/or monitoring these activities, Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) requirements and other applicable worker safety regulations would be followed. For a discussion on environmental justice and protection of children refer to Section 4.12.

3.7.7 Electrical Systems/Natural Gas

Electricity

Georgia Power furnishes electrical services to Fort Benning via a distribution system owned by Flint Electrical Membership Corporation (Flint EMC), which will be incorporated into the distribution list of this EA. Transmission lines at the Post have a carrying capacity of approximately 80 megawatts. Peak demand for electrical power usually occurs in July or August and averages about 53 megawatts. Future increases in electrical energy needs are considered to be well within the capacity of the existing system. In addition, approximately 49 emergency generators exist at the Post.

A transmission corridor owned by Flint EMC also runs northeast/southwest along the southern portion of the preferred alternative site. The corridor is approximately 20-feet wide and encompasses approximately 5 acres. Flint EMC owns the distribution system; however, the land is
government-owned. It is not anticipated that the corridor would impact the construction of the proposed shopping center; however, the corridor may need to be moved to an alternate location. Relocation of this transmission corridor would be coordinated by Flint EMC and Post personnel.

**Natural Gas and Propane**

Natural gas service is provided by United Cities Gas via a government-owned pipeline distribution system. Approximately 80 miles of gas distribution lines exist at the Post. Fort Benning is currently consuming approximately 835,000 hundred cubic feet (hcf) of natural gas per year with approximately 110,000 hcf of natural gas per year remaining. Propane is used regularly at Fort Benning with deliveries being made year-round.

**Energy Conservation**

In 1994, the President, by Executive Order 12902 (superceded by Executive Order 13123), set a fiscal year (FY) 2005 energy reduction goal for DoD installations of 30% and a 35% reduction goal by FY2010. To establish an objective comparison of energy consumption patterns between installations, Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) adopted the concept of stationary consumption. One thousand (1,000) British thermal units (MBTU) per thousand feet of building floor space are the units chosen for consumption of electricity and heating/cooling fuels. The EMC incorporates conservation components into new construction projects; retrofits older buildings and residences with energy efficient lighting, heating and insulation; and implements a public awareness program. The design of new facilities incorporates energy conservation features, such as building insulation, low-energy lighting, efficient heating and cooling systems, energy-saving water heaters and appliances, and optimum use of natural ventilation and lighting. Since the TRADOC energy reduction program began in FY1992, Fort Benning has achieved reductions in energy consumption equal to 12% below the most recent Executive Order standard for the year 2000 goals (AAFES 2003).

**3.8 Hazardous Materials and Wastes**

The Post maintains a Hazardous Waste Facility Permit (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA] Part B) No. HW-021 (S)-2 and Facility ID No. GA3210020084). The Post also maintains an Installation Hazardous Waste Management Plan (IHWMP) that establishes the implementation methods for the permit and identifies seven hazardous waste generating sources on the Post. Each type of hazardous waste is identified with a plan for collection, storage, and disposal.

Fort Benning operates under a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan for all facilities where hazardous materials are stored. The SPCC Plan delineates measures and practices that require implementation to prevent and/or minimize spill/release from storage and
handling of hazardous materials to protect ground and waters surfaces. Basic best management practices (BMPs) for pollution prevention will include monitoring of storage areas, secondary containment, and loading/unloading areas to ensure that products are not spilled during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility. Implementation of these measures during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the new AAFES facility would ensure the protection of soil and water resources.

No recognized environmental conditions were identified for the preferred alternative site based on a site reconnaissance, telephone interviews, review of historical aerial photographs; and review of regulatory agency database listings. In addition, there are no records of contamination being found in samples from a groundwater monitoring well previously installed at the Alternative 7 site. No hazardous materials are used, nor generated, at the preferred site.

3.9 Biological Resources

This chapter describes the existing biological features at Fort Benning and provides a description of biological resources on the preferred alternative site. The following discussion is based on a review of available literature, information provided by environmental personnel at Fort Benning. In addition, information on threatened and endangered flora and fauna was received from the GA DNR Natural Heritage Program (NHP).

3.9.1 Vegetation

Fort Benning is included within the broad, oak-hickory-pine forest area of the southeastern United States. Changes in agriculture and forestry practices and land ownership over the past 150 years have contributed significantly to a change to a predominantly coniferous or coniferous/deciduous mixture. Fort Benning vegetation consists of approximately 16,000 acres of maintained lawn and grassed areas; 3,000 acres of open land and old fields (shrubs and herbaceous plants); and, approximately 161,000 acres of woodland. Loblolly (Pinus taeda) and longleaf pine (Pinus palustris) are the principal conifers on the reservation and comprise approximately 64,000 acres of woodlands. The remaining 97,000 acres of woodland are comprised of approximately 21,000 acres of mixed pine and hardwoods and 76,000 acres of hardwood forest.

A limited survey of habitats present on the preferred alternative site performed by an AAFES consultant concluded that the site is predominated by two vegetation communities. These communities include hardwood forest on the hillsides adjacent the intermittent streams and approximately 34 acres of pine and mixed pine stands greater than 30 years old near the central plateau.
The stand of widely spaced short-leaf pine (*Pinus echinata*) and loblolly pine that dominates the central plateau has an herbaceous understory maintained through the use of controlled burning. Common species observed in this community include bluestem (*Andropogon virginica*), barnyard grass (*Paspalum spp.*), panic grasses (*Panic sp.*), goldenrod (*Solidago sp.*), asters (*Astor sp.*), daisy fleabane (*Erigeron sp.*), lespedeza (*Lespedeza sp.*), and dewberry (*Rubus sp.*).

The slopes descending from the plateau to the intermittent streams are primarily middle-aged mesic oak-hickory forest. Common overstory species growing in this community include southern red oak (*Quercus falcata*), red oak (*Q. rubra*), white oak (*Q. alba*), water oak (*Q. nigra*), hickory (*Carya sp.*), flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), sourwood (*Oxydendrum arboreum*), and sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*). Minor components of the overstory are loblolly pine, blackcherry (*Prunus serotina*), American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), and near the summit, post oak (*Q. stellata*). Understory species observed were blueberry (*Vaccinium sp.*), greenbrier (*Smilax rotundifolia*), muscadine (*Vitus rotundifolia*), and scattered grasses (*Chasmanthium sp.*).

### 3.9.2 Wildlife

Fort Benning is inhabited by approximately 345 species of wildlife (Fort Benning 2004). These species include 152 species of birds, 47 species of mammals, 47 species of reptiles, 24 species of amphibians, 67 species of fish, and 8 species of mussels (shellfish; Fort Benning 2001).

State and/or Federal laws protect many species of wildlife. Harvest of game species, such as white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*), bobwhite quail (*Colinus virginianus*), rabbits (*Sylvilagus sp.*), catfish (*Ictalurus sp.*), and largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), is regulated by Post personnel, GA DNR, and the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Federal and state laws are addressed in United States Army Infantry Center (USAIC) Circular 200-3-1 “Hunting Seasons and Bag Limits” and USAIC Regulation 200-3-2 “Hunting and Fishing Regulation.” Specific requirements for protection of some species of wildlife on Fort Benning (such as the red-cockaded woodpecker [RCW] and gopher tortoise) are contained in USAIC Regulation 210-4 “Range and Terrain Regulation.”

The Alternative 7 (preferred) site provides cover and forage habitat to support various species of mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians common to Chattahoochee and adjacent counties. Due to the lack of permanent streams or other waterbodies on site, fish and mussels are not likely to inhabit the site. Common mammals that likely utilize the site are white-tailed deer, Eastern grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*), Eastern cottontail (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), and coyote (*Canis latrans*).
Bird species likely to inhabit or utilize the preferred site are American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), blue jay (*Cyanocitta cristata*), Carolina chickadee (*Parus carolinensis*), dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*), northern cardinal (*Cardinalis cardinalis*), northern flicker (*Colaptes auratus*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), woodpeckers (*Picoides* spp.), sparrows, and warblers. Game birds either observed directly or indirectly on site during November 2000 were mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*) and Eastern wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*).

Reptiles and amphibians likely to inhabit the site include the eastern garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis*), rat snakes (*Elaphe obsoleta*), eastern box turtle (*Terrapene carolina*), green anole (*Anolis carolinensis*), skinks (*Eumeces* spp.), and toads (*Bufo* spp.).

### 3.9.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

Ninety-six (96) species (four amphibians, eight birds, seven fishes, four mammals, four mussels, nine reptiles, and 60 plants) of conservation concern are located on Fort Benning. Army installations must be sensitive to those species that are listed as endangered or threatened under State law, but that are not federally listed (AR 200-3). State-listed species are not protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA); however, whenever feasible, the Post cooperates with State authorities in an effort to identify and conserve state-listed species.

Five federally listed, threatened, and endangered species occur on Fort Benning. These include the red-cockaded woodpecker (E), wood stork (E), bald eagle (T), American alligator (T [S/A], in which S/A = due to similar appearance), and relict trillium (E). The red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) is the only federally protected species known to occur within the vicinity of the preferred alternative site. On March 17, 2005, in response to a letter received from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Fort Benning Conservation Branch personnel surveyed the proposed site of the new shopping center for the presence of the federally endangered relict trillium. All areas that were determined to be suitable habitat were surveyed and no relict trilliums were observed.

**Red-Cockaded Woodpecker**

The RCW (*Picoides borealis*) was placed on the Federal list of endangered species in 1970. The reasons for its protected status included species rarity, documented declines in local populations and reductions in available nesting habitat. Although populations have become more fragmented and isolated, the RCW is rather widely distributed. The species is still found in all Southern and Southeastern Coastal States from eastern Texas into southern Virginia, and small interior populations are found in southeastern Oklahoma and southern Arkansas, and until recently, southeastern
Kentucky. The largest populations are in the Coastal Plain forests of the Carolinas, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, eastern Texas, and in the Sandhills forests of the Carolinas (USFWS Biological Opinion 1999).

Fort Benning has one of the largest RCW populations in the southeastern United States. The RCWs are well dispersed over the entire Post, except that no active clusters are located on the Alabama portion of the Post. On September 27, 2002, the USFWS approved Fort Benning’s Endangered Species Management Plan (ESMP) for the RCW and issued a Biological Opinion (BO) that included specific management activities. This allowed the implementation of the “1996 Management Guidelines” for the RCW on Army installations. Fort Benning is also one of 13 primary core locations selected by the USFWS to manage for a RCW recovery population (451 clusters for Fort Benning). Presently, Fort Benning has a total of 311 manageable RCW clusters (251 active and 60 inactive, as of 2003). There is an additional estimate of 43 active clusters and one inactive cluster in ordnance impact areas A20 and K15.

The Alternative 7 site is potential foraging habitat for the federally endangered RCW. Fourteen (14) RCW trees associated with abandoned cluster AA-01 are present on the site; this site has been inactive for more than 10 years and was deleted from management in 1998 (Brent 2000). The area is not foraging habitat for any currently active clusters and is not in the foraging circle for any inactive clusters (the normal foraging range for RCW is 0.5 mile (Barron 2005). The nearest active cluster is approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the preferred site and the nearest inactive cluster is approximately 1 mile to the southwest. The nearest planned recruitment site is located approximately 1 mile southeast of the Alternative 7 site.

3.10 Cultural Resources

Historic properties are protected by a variety of laws and regulations, including the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Section 106 of the NHPA and implementing regulations (36 CFR 800) outline the procedures to be followed in the documentation, evaluation, and mitigation of impacts for historic properties. The Section 106 process applies to any Federal undertaking that has the potential to affect historic properties. Projects that require Federal funding or are subject to Federal regulation also are subject to the Section 106 process, and ensuring compliance with the process is the responsibility of the relevant Federal agency. Due to time and resource constraints, project proponents usually fund and contract
for the actual work to be done, and the Federal agencies do the formal consulting required by the regulations.

The GA DNR Historic Preservation Division (GA HPD) and sometimes the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) must be consulted regarding impacts to cultural resources and means to mitigate the impact. Once resources have been identified, and impacts defined, mitigation measures are determined. Depending on the resources encountered, federally recognized American Indian Tribes, with whom Fort Benning confers, may also be consulted.

The area of potential effect (APE) is the geographical area or areas within which an undertaking may cause changes to the character or use of historic properties. Under Alternative 7 (the preferred alternative), the preliminary APE has been defined by AAFES as an approximate 22-acre parcel located north of the existing PX facility on Fort Benning.

The purpose of this assessment is to identify whether known archaeological sites and historic structures are within the APEs, and to assess the potential for unidentified cultural resources to exist in the APEs. The assessment included a site visit to confirm expectations with regard to environmental and cultural settings, review of archaeological survey reports completed for the area, and consultation with Dr. Chris Hamilton, Fort Benning Archaeologist, regarding known resources on the Post. Coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has been completed. The SHPO concurred that the preferred alternative would not affect any resources eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP; see Appendix B).

3.11 Land Use

Fort Benning is the site of training, administrative, and residential activities, as well as associated land management activities. Fort Benning’s Land Use Plan establishes both current and future land use activities on the Post. Fort Benning is divided into five land management units (LMUs): Main Post, Sand Hill, Kelly Hill, Harmony Church, and housing areas. These five LMUs are divided into 31 training areas. These training areas are further subdivided into training compartments, ranges, impact zones, drop zones, exclusion areas, cantonment areas, and recreation areas. Combined, the cantonment and family housing areas occupy approximately 8% of the Post. A 1,095-acre recreation area is also located along Uchee Creek on the western bank of the Chattahoochee River.

Main Post, adjacent to South Columbus, is the largest and most developed of the cantonment areas, containing the Installation Headquarters, the Infantry School, and the barracks complex known as the Cuartels. Main Post includes Lawson Army Airfield, Martin Army Community Hospital, the Post Exchange, the commissary and various family housing areas. Sand Hill contains barracks, dining facilities, classrooms, and other facilities for training. Kelley Hill, contains barracks and support
facilities. Harmony Church contains semi-permanent barracks and support structures. An active program is underway to eliminate some of these structures for the reuse of formerly occupied areas for land reclamation (forestry) and other uses, such as Major Construction, Army (MCA) and other projects (AAFES 2003).

Field training activities occur on about 104,000 acres of the Post. Activities include the movement of personnel through wooded and open areas on foot, movement of wheeled vehicles on dirt and gravel roads, and the establishment of bivouac sites. Activities conducted by the mechanized infantry and tank units at Fort Benning are limited by the amount of suitable terrain to support movement of heavy vehicles. Armor, artillery, and mortar firing occurs from established firing points at three major range areas on the Post: the Alpha Range Complex, Malone Range Complex, and Oscar-Kilo Range Complex. Fire is directed toward controlled-impact areas covering approximately 59,000 acres. Other weapons fired at the ranges include miscellaneous rifles, pistols, anti-armor, and automatic weapons, as well as special training devices that electronically simulate the firing of weapons systems at targets. Other activities related to military training include training in the operation and maintenance of vehicles, academic military training, and physical training.
4 Environmental Consequences

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the potential environmental consequences of each alternative on potentially affected media. The analysis is separated into effects resulting from the construction of the shopping center at the preferred site (Alternative 7), as well as the analysis of the No Action Alternative/Status Quo (Alternative 8). Threshold levels of significance criteria are used to evaluate potential impacts, which are discussed at the beginning of each resource area.

4.2 Socioeconomic Resources

The threshold level of significance for socioeconomic resources is the potential for the project to result in a substantial population increase, displace residents, or result in a substantial change in employment or income.

4.2.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

Demographics

Under Alternative 7, demographic compositions are expected to remain the same. Although the customer base would likely increase by approximately 2,000 persons at the new shopping center, these increases would likely result in no compositional changes of gender, age, or race (Taylor 2000a). Therefore, implementation of Alternative 7 would result in no effect to demographics. No mitigation measures are proposed.

Economy, Employment, and Income

The construction of the proposed shopping facility at Fort Benning would result in a slight positive effect to the economy, employment, and income for the Post and income for the surrounding areas. The proposed facility would employ approximately 190 people: 80% military dependent; 15% civilian; and, 5% active military. Because of the convenience of the Alternative 7 site location
combined with the sale of tax-free goods, the customer base is expected to increase by approximately 2,000 customers per day (Taylor 2000a). Since most competing grocery and department stores are located approximately 6 to 7 miles away in the northern portion of Columbus, no effect would be expected on the local economy (Carveza 2000). No mitigation measures are proposed.

### 4.2.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative

The no-action alternative would have no effect on demographic compositions; however, the economic activity and incomes at Fort Benning would result in potential moderate adverse impacts. The existing PX facility is highly congested and too small to adequately service the customer base; upgrades are needed to food concepts, mechanical equipment, and parking facilities. Fort Benning would likely be unable to meet future demands and, therefore, customers would likely shop elsewhere resulting in a loss of revenue for AAFES and Fort Benning, thereby, potentially resulting in the closure of the PX facility and the loss of jobs for those employed at the existing PX facility. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

### 4.3 Water Resources

The threshold level of significance for water resources is the potential of the project to cause substantial changes in wetlands functions, groundwater or surface water flows, increased risk of flooding, the potential to violate an applicable water quality standard for protection of fish and wildlife, or degradation of a water body used as a potable water source.

#### 4.3.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

**Surface Water**

Construction of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would result in the loss of natural vegetation and trees on approximately 18.25 acres. Because of the vegetation loss during construction activities, highly erodible soils located at the Alternative 7 site would be exposed and the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation to the unnamed tributaries and Hamlet Creek would increase resulting in minor adverse impacts. During construction activities, the contractor would be required to implement strict erosion-control measures to prevent increased erosion and sedimentation during construction in accordance with the Georgia general permit (GAR 100001). The provisions of the general stormwater permit require the following: 1) submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to GA EPD; 2) development of an Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control (ES&PC) Plan that describes BMPs to be implemented at a site (vegetative and structural); 3) implementation of a comprehensive monitoring program (CMP), which includes rainfall and stormwater discharge...
turbidity monitoring. The ES&PC Plan and CMP must be submitted to GA EPD, as well as the turbidity monitoring reports and a Notice of Termination (NOT) when construction is completed.

All on-site activities would be accomplished in accordance with the SWPPP. Implementation of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would include measures similar to existing stormwater BMPs at the PX and measures recommended in the SWPPP and would include BMPs to control erosion from entering nearby creeks and waterways. Surface drainage from all paved and landscaped areas would be routed to two separate detention areas that would mitigate storm surcharges and would aid in removing non-point source pollutants generated from stormwater runoff at the site. Project design would also include BMPs for control of surface drainage that could contain hazardous materials, such as oil and grease in accordance with the IHWMP.

The contractor and AAFES would also be required to prepare and implement an SPCC Plan during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility. The SPCC Plan would delineate measures and practices that would be implemented to prevent and/or minimize spill/release from hazardous materials into water surfaces. Basic BMPs for pollution prevention would include monitoring of storage areas exposed to the elements to ensure that pollutants are not discharged into storm drains during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility. These measures would ensure the protection of water resources. Additionally, under the new Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) requirements, the same BMPs would address water pollution from storage areas. All facilities within the food court would meet requirements to ensure that any aboveground storage tanks for oil/grease management are properly managed and that they do not discharge directly into the storm drains. MS4 requirements would address possible sewage overflows and backups that could reach waterways. Measures would also need to be implemented to ensure that these products would not interfere with the sanitary sewer disposal to be established under the Columbus Water Works system. Adherence to the above-mentioned plans and regulations would limit potential adverse effects to surface water to minor adverse effects. No additional mitigation measures are proposed.

**Groundwater**

Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 (preferred) site would be within an aquifer recharge area. All onsite construction and operation activities would be required to be in accordance with the Fort Benning SWPPP. Hazardous materials would be stored and disposed of in accordance with all local, state, and Federal laws and regulations, and the IHWMP; SPCC Plan; and Installation Spill Contingency Plan (ISCP). Surface drainage from all paved and landscaped areas would be routed to two separate detention areas that would mitigate storm surcharges and would aid in removing non-point source pollutants generated from stormwater runoff at the site. Project design
would also include BMPs for control of surface drainage that could contain hazardous materials, such as oil and grease in accordance with the IHWMP. Because of adherence to existing plans and regulations, no adverse effects to groundwater resources would be expected. No mitigation measures are proposed.

**Wetlands**

The implementation of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would result in adverse effects to approximately 0.114 acres of wetlands and 26 linear feet of intermittent stream permanently converting these areas to improved land (shopping center footprint). These streams are considered to be waters of the United States and are protected by the State of Georgia in accordance with the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act. According to the Georgia Department of Environmental Protection, road crossings and drainage structures are exempt from stream buffer protection requirements (Chambers 2004). Therefore, this project would not require a stream buffer variance (Chambers 2004).

Ecology & Environment, Inc. provided a wetlands delineation report to the USACE for review and approval. Based on the findings of this report, the USACE granted the use of Nationwide Permit #18 (Appendix C) and does not require an individual Section 404 permit. There would be no change in wetlands function due to this alternative.

The use of this permit is allowed if and only if AAFES adheres to the following permit conditions:

- The activity is conducted in accordance with the information provided and meets the conditions applicable to the Nationwide Permit as described in Part C of the excerpt of the 67 CFR and the attached copy of the Savannah District Nationwide Permit Regional Conditions.
- AAFES obtain a stream buffer variance, if required.
- The attached permit sheet is signed and returned 30 days prior to completion of the activity authorized by this permit.

Although the wetlands are being permanently impacted, because of the small amount and the ability to utilize the Nationwide Permit, these impacts would be considered minor adverse impacts. No additional mitigation measures are proposed under this alternative.

**4.3.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative**

Implementation of the no-action alternative would require no new construction activities on the Post. Because there would be no construction activities, there would be no effect to surface waters, groundwater, wetlands or floodplains. However, the maintenance and operation of the
existing PX facility would continue to be performed in accordance with the Fort Benning SWPPP. Hazardous materials would be stored and disposed of in accordance with all local, state, and Federal laws and regulations, and the IHWMP; SPCC Plan; and ISCP. In addition, under a new assessment in accordance with Columbus Water Works and future MS4 requirements, the implementation of new BMPs would provide additional protection against pollutants entering into sewer lines (sanitary and storm water) and degrading will improve water quality. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.4 Noise

The threshold level of significance for noise is the increase of Zone III (incompatible) noise contours where sensitive noise receptors (i.e., residences, hospitals, libraries) are located.

4.4.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

Construction

Under Alternative 7, ambient noise levels at and around the construction site would temporarily increase during construction. The preferred alternative site would be located in Zone 1, where noise sensitive receptors (i.e., housing, schools, and medical facilities) are compatible with the noise environment (Figure 2-2; US Army 1997). Standard construction equipment would be used, including log chippers and shredders, bulldozers, front end loaders, pans track hoes, backhoes, graders, dump trucks, vibrating compactors, sheepsfoot compactors, trenchers, cranes, equipment repair truck, ready-mix trucks, concrete pumping trucks, curb and gutter machines, pavers, forklifts, and building material and equipment delivery trucks. Based on data presented in the U.S. EPA publication, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances (U.S. EPA 1971), outdoor construction noise levels range from 78 dBA to 89 dBA, approximately 50 feet from a typical construction site. However, as indicated previously, the sensitive receptors are all located a distance greater than 50 feet from the preferred alternative site; therefore, there would be no increase of Zone III noise contours into areas containing sensitive noise receptors. Table 4-1 presents typical noise levels (dBA at 50 feet) estimated by U.S. EPA for the main phases of construction.
Table 4-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA Leq at 50 feet from source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Clearing</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation, Grading</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- dBA = A-weighted decibels.

Furthermore, these noise levels would be short-term noise effects lasting for approximately 20 months from the commencement of site work to the end of construction activities at the preferred site. Also, vehicular traffic noise would increase due to workers driving to the site and because an average of ten (maximum of 20) construction vehicles per day would visit the site (Beachler 2000). As part of the Proposed Action, the adverse effects would be minimized by limiting construction activity to daylight hours and by using properly maintained and muffled equipment. Noise associated with implementation of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would be limited primarily to construction and would represent a localized short-term minor adverse effect and would not affect any noise sensitive receptors located greater than 50 feet away from the preferred alternative site.

**Operation**

Noise from operation of the Proposed Action on the Alternative 7 site would be limited primarily to an increase in the number of vehicles in the area, including delivery trucks and patron traffic. Deliveries from trucks would be expected to increase from 10 to 15 per day, and an extra 2,000 patrons in addition to the 4,300 existing patrons, would be expected to visit the new shopping center per day (Taylor 2000b). This increase in vehicular traffic would have a corresponding increase in noise levels. Facility operating hours would be from Monday through Saturday, 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and Sunday, 10 a.m. to 7 p.m., with the exception of a few shops that may maintain variable operating hours. Noise associated with operational activities would be limited primarily to circulation of vehicles, including truck deliveries, during the hours of operation. Compared to existing noise levels, the noise levels from increased traffic activity would be expected to add a minimal increase to existing ambient noise levels within the project area, resulting in a long-term minor adverse effect. This long-term minor adverse effect would not result in incompatible noise activities to sensitive noise receptors located within Zone 1. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.
4.4.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, existing noise levels would remain the same. Because the status quo would be maintained, adverse effects to sensitive receptors at Fort Benning would not occur. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.5 Air Quality

The threshold level of significance for air quality for this project has been set at the same threshold used for new stationary sources for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) of air quality within a region. While this threshold is used for stationary sources, it provides a reasonable measure of the impact of a Proposed Action for air quality evaluation purposes. The sources of emissions related to this project are mobile sources, and stationary source emissions, which are not likely to change as a result of this action.

4.5.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

Long-term effects to the immediate project area would occur from emissions due to an increase in deliveries and customer vehicular traffic. However, because the expanded facility would be located on Fort Benning, it is anticipated that it would attract more customers and reduce the number of trips to Columbus. Therefore, total vehicle emissions for the Columbus area would likely remain the same as a result of the Proposed Action. The preferred alternative site is contained within the footprint of the chlorine gas release worst-case scenario; however, the site is located on the fringe of a 1.3-mile impact circle. No long-term effects would result from implementing the Proposed Action on the Alternative 7 site.

However, the operation of heavy equipment would have minor, temporary negative effects on air quality during the construction phase. These negative effects would be primarily in the form of increased exhaust pollutants that would be minimized through good vehicle maintenance. Windblown soil and dust could also occur during the construction phase as a result of equipment movement over exposed soil areas. Fugitive dust would be greatly minimized by implementing appropriate dust control measures, such as wetting the surfaces and by re-vegetating disturbed areas as soon as possible. Therefore, the primary short-term air quality impacts resulting from the Proposed Action would be a temporary increase of air pollutants during construction, which would cease upon completion of the project.

Construction would take approximately 20 months to complete, although 12 months of construction is evaluated to estimate annual emissions. Following the removal of marketable timber,
remaining slash and vegetation debris would be removed via trucks and other heavy equipment prior to construction; no burning would take place under this alternative. The construction activities considered in this evaluation include the operation of construction equipment and vehicles, site preparation (for particulate emissions), and paving operations (for VOC emissions). The number and type of equipment would vary depending upon the amount and type of work being completed at the Alternative 7 site. The operation of construction equipment has been generalized, assuming that at any given time, one of each type of equipment would be operating, 5 days a week, 8 hours a day.

Total estimated annual construction emissions for implementing the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site are listed below in Table 4-2. The construction equipment, activities, emission factors and calculations are detailed in Appendix D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operation</td>
<td>45.59</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>45.59</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ^a Approximately 90% of total PM10 emissions would be PM2.5 (Gustafson 2005).

Key:
- CO = Carbon monoxide.
- NOx = Nitrogen oxides.
- PM10 = Particulate matter (10 microns or less).
- SO2 = Sulfur dioxide.
- VOC = Volatile organic compound.

Since emissions of all criteria pollutants are below the 100 and 250-tpy thresholds, this action would not be considered a major source. In addition, VOCs and NOx are below the \textit{de minimis} standards established by the Conformity Rule, and therefore these emissions would not impact ozone concentrations in the area. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

### 4.5.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in no new construction activities. However, the existing PX/commissary facility would continue to operate and would result in the same amount of air effects that currently exist. Therefore, there would be no change in existing conditions. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.
4.6 Earth Resources

The threshold level for earth resources (i.e., soils and topography, and geology) is any ground disturbance or other activities that would violate applicable Federal or State laws and regulations, such as the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, and the potential for Notices of Violation for the failure to receive applicable state permits, such as the NPDES construction permit under the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, prior to initiating the Proposed Action. Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would have both short-term and long-term adverse impacts to earth resources at Fort Benning, while the implementation of Alternative 8 would have no effect on soils, topography, or geology resources.

4.6.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

At the Alternative 7 site, project development would require the removal of a large amount of vegetative cover, as well as some extensive grading over approximately 18.25 acres. During construction, efforts would be made to preserve vegetation during construction activities to minimize soil disturbance on the preferred site. Topography changes on this site would require the use of fill from other areas of the site, no fill would be required from other areas of the Post. Clearing and grading during construction would not impact any geologic features. Short-term moderate adverse construction impacts may result in an increase in soil erosion. Any increased exposure of the Nankin soils could result in the formation of gullies and a potential increase in erosion resulting in a moderate adverse effect to soil resources. Efforts would be made to minimize excavation in order to control erosion and soil runoff. Long-term adverse effects would be dependent on the level of exposure of the Nankin soils. If the overlying sands were preserved and all structures were kept an adequate distance above the clays, minimal effects would be expected. All exposed clay surfaces would require grading and erosion-control measures. Construction directly on the clay soil could result in future problems, such as heavy erosion.

Adherence to the ES&PC Plan and NPDES permit would be required and would include measures to minimize adverse effects to soils and topography. As part of the NPDES permit, AAFES would be required to prepare, certify, and submit an ESPCP. Components of the ES&PC Plan would include: project description, soil information, changes to existing contours, existing drainage patterns, best management practices and locations, detailed drawings, and a timeline for the completion of construction activities. Erosion controls and structures for this permit would likely be extensive due to the quality of the soils present at the preferred site and would be designed and implemented in accordance with the Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in Georgia. Additionally, under the NPDES permit, SPCC Plan measures would be required during construction activities to prevent
and/or minimize spill/release from hazardous materials into ground surfaces. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

**4.6.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative**

Implementation of the no-action alternative would require no new construction or land disturbance activities on the Post; therefore, no topographic resources, geologic features, or soils would be affected. Furthermore, the Post would continue to adhere to Federal and State laws and regulations, established Post policies and guidelines, such as erosion control BMPs and spill control measures at the existing PX/commissary site. No impacts would be expected on topographic resources, geologic features, or soils. No additional mitigation is proposed for this alternative.

**4.7 Infrastructure/Utilities**

The threshold level of significance for infrastructure and utilities and public safety is the potential for project-related changes to create a substantial increase in demand for utilities and the capacity of these utilities to supply the additional demand, adherence to OSHA requirements, and adequate management of unauthorized access to the construction site. Because of the age, poor design, and structural problems of the existing PX, the potential exists that the new design and construction would be more efficient in the use of energy, materials, and services. It is anticipated, therefore, that there would be a minor positive effect to infrastructure and utilities. No mitigation measures are proposed.

**4.7.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site**

**Stormwater Drainage**

Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would result in the loss of natural vegetation and trees on approximately 18.25 acres. Because of the vegetation loss during construction activities, highly erodible soils located at the preferred alternative site would be exposed and the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation to the unnamed tributaries and Hamlet Creek would increase. During construction activities, the contractor would be required to implement strict erosion-control measures to prevent increased erosion and sedimentation during construction in accordance with the Georgia general permit (GAR100001). BMPs and conditions of the NPDES permit would limit potential adverse effects to surface water to minor adverse effects.
**Potable Water, Wastewater, and Water Reclamation**

An estimated 50,000 gallons per day (gpd) of water would be used for the Proposed Action (Beachler 2000). There is no water strain with existing demand or with projected demands. Approximately two day’s worth of reserves exists for the Post (Wilkins 2000). An existing 20-inch water main located on the Alternative 7 site would provide adequate domestic and fire protection supplies exist for the proposed additional construction (Beachler 2000).

The existing sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment system has the capacity to accommodate the estimated amount of wastewater to be generated by implementing the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site. During construction, demand is expected to be 100 gpd during site work, 40 gpd during construction, and 50,000 gpd during regular operation. The Post’s withdrawal permit allows the withdrawal of no more than 12 mgd per day (Wilkins 2000). Overall implementation of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would result in a minor positive effect as a result of the new efficiencies created during the design of the new AAFES facility.

**Solid Waste Management**

Solid waste generation would not change substantially as a result of construction of the Proposed Action; however, because of the anticipated increase in permanent employees, customer base (2,000 new customers), and overall deliveries and inventory of goods, there would be an anticipated increase in overall solid waste generation during the operation of the AAFES facility. However, this increase in solid waste generation would likely be offset by the increase in recyclable products available at the new shopping center, resulting in a minor positive effect. All recycled materials generated during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the new facility, such as cardboard and paper, would be recycled through participation in the on-Post recycling program.

**Transportation Systems**

The threshold level of significance for transportation systems is the potential to substantially impact existing traffic flow, traffic volumes and/or existing traffic levels of service.

**Construction Traffic**

Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would increase the volume of traffic slightly in the project area due to on-road use by construction equipment, construction workforce vehicles, and vehicles delivering construction materials and fill material. Approximately 25 trips maximum would be required on a daily basis for construction. Concrete trucks, crane, and dump trucks would be the largest loads on the roads. The size of the construction workforce and number of daily truck trips would vary during construction activities.
To minimize the minor adverse effects to the transportation system, the contractor would implement the following mitigation measures:

- Provide adequate off-street parking for all construction workers to avoid increased congestion near roadsides;
- Encourage construction workers to carpool to the site; and
- Schedule truck trips at intervals over the entire working day, thus avoiding peak-hour traffic times.

**Operations Traffic**

The Alternative 7 site is located along I-185, which accesses the main gate; therefore, many of the vehicles expected to visit the proposed site would likely be vehicles that currently drive past this site. The increase in traffic due to implementing the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site is expected to be a small percentage of the total volume of traffic currently present in the area and is not expected to affect the current levels of service for adjacent roadways and intersections.

**Public and Occupational Health and Safety**

Adequate emergency services for fire, security, and medical care are available and no effects would be expected to occur under any of the alternatives. Construction site safety measures would include limiting access to the construction site to authorized personnel and ensuring that all workers adhere to safety standards established by Fort Benning and OSHA. No effects to public and occupational health and safety would be anticipated.

**Electrical Systems/Natural Gas**

Under the preferred alternative, there would be no adverse impacts to utilities. The new construction would use modern construction materials and new fixtures, which are considered to be better insulated and more energy efficient than those in many of the existing facilities on the Post. Therefore, there would be a minor positive effect to electrical systems through the use of improved fixtures and construction materials.

**4.7.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative**

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would require no new construction activities on the Post. Because of the age of the facility and poor design, continued use of this facility may result in a continued inefficient use of energy resources and increased maintenance requirements. Therefore, it is anticipated that this would result in a minor adverse effect to services provided to facilities, such as potable water, wastewater, and water reclamation, and electrical systems/natural gas. No effect would
be anticipated to stormwater drainage, solid waste management, public and occupational health and safety, and transportation. No mitigation measures are proposed under this alternative.

4.8 Hazardous Materials and Wastes

The threshold level of significance for hazardous materials and wastes is the potential to substantially affect human health, safety, or the environment.

4.8.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative

A hazardous waste assessment was conducted by an AAFES contractor in accordance with The American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) “Practice E 1527-00 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process” (ASTM Practice) at the Alternative 7 site. This assessment concluded that there is no known history or evidence of the use, storage, or dumping of hazardous or toxic materials at the Alternative 7 site.

Construction of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would require the use of heavy machinery that would require maintenance and fuel. Although maintenance would most likely be performed off-site and within an authorized service shop, the use of construction machinery could potentially introduce small quantities of solvents, cleaning agents, greases, oils, hydraulic fluids, and fuel (e.g., gasoline and diesel). Paints and adhesives would also be used on the site during project construction. Hazardous materials would be stored and disposed of in accordance with all local, state, and Federal laws and regulations, and the IHWMP, the SPCC Plan, and the ISCP. Hazardous materials, including retail-sized containers of motor oil, paints and solvents, would likely be stored at the site during operation of the new shopping center. However, these materials would be stored solely for retail sale and individual, off-site use by military personnel and their families. No significant quantities of hazardous materials would be used or stored on-site.

Basic SPCC requirements at the Post delineate measures and practices that should be implemented to prevent and/or minimize spill/release from the storage and handling of hazardous materials to protect soil and water. Basic BMPs for pollution prevention would include monitoring of storage areas, secondary containment and loading/unloading areas to ensure that products are not spilled during construction and operation of the Proposed Action. Compliance with Federal laws and regulations, and the IHWMP, the SPCC Plan, and the ISCP would minimize the effect to no adverse effect. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.
4.8.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would not result in any construction activities on Fort Benning. Any hazardous materials located on the existing PX site would be stored and disposed of in accordance with all local, State, and Federal laws and regulations, and the IHWM, the SPCC Plan, and the ISCP. In addition, basic SPCC requirements at the Post would be implemented to delineate measures and practices that would prevent and/or minimize spill/release from the storage and handling of hazardous materials to protect soil and water. BMPs for pollution prevention would include monitoring of storage areas, secondary containment and loading/unloading areas to ensure that products are not spilled during construction and operation of the Proposed Action. Implementation of these measures would continue to result in no adverse effect. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.9 Biological Resources

The threshold level of significance for federally protected species would include the disruption of normal behavior patterns or disturbance to habitat at a level that would substantially impact the Post’s ability to either avoid jeopardy or to conserve and recover the species. The threshold level of significance for vegetation is removal in amounts that would alter the habitat in a manner detrimental to the species living there.

4.9.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

Vegetation

Construction of the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site would require the permanent removal of trees and shrubs from a large portion of the approximately 18.25-acre site for the building, parking areas, access drives, stormwater retention basins resulting in a minor adverse effect. During design and construction efforts would be made to minimize the impacts to vegetation by retaining a portion of the vegetation on the site. The majority of the site has a history of disturbance from soil removal and grading and past timber harvesting activities on the hardwood slopes. Construction of the project would not significantly contribute to fragmentation of the existing forest habitat because the Alternative 7 site is located within a predominantly urbanized area (e.g., paved roads, shopping center, bowling alley, hospital, etc.) that supports the Post personnel and their families.

Project design would include green areas, adjacent parking areas, existing roadways, and other unpaved surfaces. It is anticipated that these areas would be cleared of their existing vegetation and would be landscaped with native shrub and tree species. Site clearing activities has the potential
to create erosion and sedimentation problems. Following BMPs as discussed in Section 4.3 “Surface Water” would minimize the adverse effect. No additional mitigation measures are proposed.

**Wildlife**

Implementing the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would result in the permanent loss of approximately 18.25 acres of habitat. The majority of the species that currently use the area have adapted to living in urban areas and co-existing with human activity. Many of these same species are mobile generalists that utilize a variety of interspersed/fragmented habitats, range over wide areas for food and cover, and/or are migratory and would use the site seasonally. Therefore, it is anticipated that most wildlife species would avoid the disturbance by relocating to adjacent minimally disturbed areas. Clearing of vegetation and earth-moving activities would result in some unavoidable mortality to burrowing and less mobile fauna. Overall, the clearing of vegetation would result in the loss of habitat for these species; however, because the footprint of the proposed facility has been reduced, habitat would remain adjacent to the shopping center. This loss of habitat would result in a minor adverse effect. No mitigation measures are proposed.

**Threatened and Endangered Species**

Based upon the limited field survey, review of available information, and appropriate agency inquiry, no federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species would be adversely affected by constructing the proposed facility on the Alternative 7 site. Consultation with the USFWS regarding impacts to the potential RCW foraging habitat on the Alternative 7 site has occurred and is documented by the coordination letter (Appendix B).

The preferred alternative site is located outside the 0.5-mile foraging range of the nearest proposed RCW recruitment cluster. It is unlikely that implementation of the Proposed Action at this site, including removal of 14 RCW trees, would adversely affect the continued existence of the RCW on Fort Benning. These 14 trees are associated with abandoned cluster AA-01, which is inactive and was deleted from management in 1998 (Barron 2005). Therefore, there would be no effect to threatened and endangered species from this alternative. No mitigation measures are proposed.

**4.9.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative**

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would require no new construction activities on the Post. Therefore, there would be no land disturbance or land clearing activities, resulting in no effect to vegetation, wildlife, or threatened and endangered species. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.
4.10 Cultural Resources

The threshold level of significance for cultural resources is the violation of applicable Federal laws and regulations, such as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and others.

4.10.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

Under Alternative 7, AAFES would construct a new PX facility on approximately 18.25 acres of undeveloped property north of the current PX facility. Based on the recent field visit, and past studies conducted within the APE and in the area, it is unlikely that cultural resources would be impacted within or near the APE. Once the proposed PX facility is completed, Soldiers’ Support Services would be relocated to the vacated, existing PX facility (Holloway 2000). Soldiers’ Support Services is currently located in a group of World War II-era structures within an older part of the Post. Once Soldiers’ Support Services moves, the old structures formerly used by Soldiers’ Support Services would be demolished (Holloway 2000), which would be considered an indirect adverse effect of the project. The demolition of these structures would be covered under the 1986 Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA 1986). Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would have no affect on resources eligible for listing on the NRHP. The SHPO concurs with this assessment as presented in the concurrence letter provided in Appendix B. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.10.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would require no new construction activities on the Post. No adverse effects have been reported during the operation and maintenance of the existing PX due to the use of established Post policies and guidelines; therefore, no effect on cultural resources is anticipated. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.11 Land Use

The threshold level of significance to for land use includes evaluating consistency with land use plans, and compatibility with existing and future surrounding land uses.
4.11.1 Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative Site

Under Alternative 7, land use would be altered. The preferred alternative site is primarily designated as “family housing,” with approximately 5% frontage of the site along Marne Road being designated as “open space” (Holloway 2000). The Alternative 7 site is currently undeveloped and wooded with the majority of the woodlands to the north and east and urbanized areas to the south and west. Construction of the proposed PX facility would result in a change of land use designation to “community.” A large portion of the 18.25 acre site would be cleared of trees. Existing peripheral trees would be preserved (Beachler 2000). On-site development would occur as described in Section 1.2 “Description of the Proposed Action.” The Proposed Action under Alternative 7 would be located entirely within Fort Benning and would not present any conflicts with local or state land-use or zoning designations.

No adverse effects are anticipated from this Proposed Action, and use of the preferred alternative site would be compatible with surrounding land uses. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.11.2 Alternative 8: No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the no-action alternative would require no new construction activities on the Post. Therefore, there would be no effect on existing land use or land use patterns. No mitigation measures are proposed for this alternative.

4.12 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 requires that any federally funded project take into consideration whether the project would have a disproportionate, adverse affect on minority and/or low-income populations. Fort Benning does not contain substantial low-income or minority populations. One neighborhood consisting of single-family residences is within 0.75 mile of the Alternative 7 project site; however, this area is not considered a low-income or minority housing area. Fort Benning also has an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action unit that coordinates efforts to maintain a non-discriminatory environment at the Post. Additionally, implementation of Alternative 8 (No-Action Alternative) would involve the continued operation of the existing facility and would require no new construction, resulting in no disproportionate, adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations. Therefore, no disproportionate adverse effects to minority or low-income populations would occur as a result of either of the possible alternatives. The project complies with the provisions of the Executive Order.
Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

Potential environmental health and safety risks to children as a result of implementing the Proposed Action at the Alternative 7 site were evaluated in accordance with Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. Implementation of Alternative 8 (No-Action Alternative) would not result in a disproportionate risk to children from environmental health risks or safety risks. The Proposed Action or alternative site locations would not include the introduction of hazardous materials to the site that would present a disproportionate risk to children. Therefore, no adverse impacts to children would occur as a result of either of the possible alternatives. The project complies with the provisions of the Executive Order.

4.13 Summary of Potential Direct and Indirect Environmental Consequences and Associated Mitigation Measures

Table 4-3 summarizes the potential environmental effects of the preferred alternative and the No-Action Alternative, along with a summary of proposed mitigation, as applicable.
### Table 4-3
Potential Environmental Effects and Proposed Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Environment</th>
<th>Alternative 7</th>
<th>No-Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>0 0 None proposed</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy, Employment, and Income</td>
<td>+ + None proposed</td>
<td>-- None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>- - Adherence to SPCC, SWPPP, and ES&amp;PC Plans</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>0 0 None proposed</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Floodplains</td>
<td>- 0 Adherence to USACE Nationwide Permit requirements</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Operations</td>
<td>- - Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours and would include the use of properly muffled equipment.</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>- 0 None proposed</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>-- 0 Adherence to existing Post management practices identified in the NPDES permit and the SPCC and ES&amp;PC Plans.</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>- 0 Adherence to SPCC, SWPPP, and ES&amp;PC Plans</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>0 0 None proposed</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage</td>
<td>- 0 Adherence to SPCC, SWPPP, and ES&amp;PC Plans</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Wastewater and Water Reclamation</td>
<td>0 + None proposed</td>
<td>- None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>0 + None proposed</td>
<td>0 None proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation Systems                      | - 0 During construction activities the following mitigation measures would be adhered to in order to minimize potential impacts:  
  • Provide adequate off-street parking for all construction workers to avoid increased congestion near roadsides;  
  • Encourage construction workers to carpool to the site; and  
  • Schedule truck trips at intervals over the entire working day, thus avoiding peak-hour traffic times. | 0 None proposed       |
| Public and Occupational Health and Safety   | 0 0 None proposed                                   | 0 None proposed       |
| Electrical Systems/Natural Gas              | 0 + None proposed                                   | - None proposed       |
| Hazardous Materials and Wastes              | 0 0 Adherence to the Post SPCC, IHWMP, and ISCP requirements | 0 Adherence to Post SPCC, IHWMP, and ISCP requirements |
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4 Environmental Consequences

Table 4-3
Potential Environmental Effects and Proposed Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Attempt to minimize impacts during initial design activities by introducing green areas and landscaping throughout the project.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mitigation for indirect effect of demolition of WWII buildings is covered under the Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement Among the United States Department of Defense, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers and no further mitigation is required.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* Construction of the proposed shopping center would result in the relocation of the Soldiers’ Support Services to the vacated, existing PX facility (Holloway 2000). Soldiers’ Support Services is currently located in a group of World War II-era structures within an older part of the Post. Once Soldiers’ Support Services moves, the old structures formerly used by Soldiers’ Support Services would be demolished (Holloway 2000). See Cumulative Impacts Section 5.3.9 for additional information.

Key:
0 = No effect  
- = Minor adverse  
-- = Moderate adverse  
--- = Significant adverse  
+ = Minor positive  
++ = Moderate positive  
+++ = Significant positive

ES&PC = Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control.  
NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.  
SPCC = Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures.  
SWPPP = Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.  
USACE = United States Army Corps of Engineers.
5  Cumulative Impacts

The CEQ (1978) defines cumulative impacts as the “impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action(s) when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.” The actions proposed under the alternatives in this EA, in addition to proposed projects in the Columbus-Phenix City area, have the possibility to result in either negative or positive impacts in a cumulative manner. These projects all occur within a well-defined and specific geographical (spatial) region of influence (ROI), which is defined in the following subsection; in addition, the projects are limited on a temporal basis since they all have the potential to be implemented within a 20-year period as indicated by the planning documents obtained for the individual cities, and therefore may increase the potential for cumulative effects. The overall ROI for the purposes of this EA consists of the northern portion of the Post and the cities of Fort Benning and Columbus, Georgia, and Phenix City, Alabama.

Reasonably foreseeable future actions in the ROI are separated by city and are discussed below. Review of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) was completed to assist with the identification of projects associated with Fort Benning and the ROI.

5.1 Past and Present Actions within the Region of Influence

The cities of Columbus, Georgia, and Phenix City, Alabama, are the sites of numerous residential developments, commercial/retail facilities, industrial activities, and recreational opportunities. The ongoing projects with the potential to impact the ROIs are discussed below.

Columbus and Fort Benning completed a “Land Exchange,” swapping two parcels of land, known as the North Tract and the South Tract, for which an Environmental Impact Statement and a Record of Decision were prepared. Columbus is currently developing the North Tract (24) land conveyed to it, a 2,470-acre parcel located adjacent to the Fort Benning northwestern boundary line.
Development of the North Tract will be primarily industrial, mixed with recreational land use. In exchange, Fort Benning received the South Tract land (32), a 2,536-acre parcel located at the southernmost end of the Post, which is currently being utilized by the Post for training and land management (reforestation and habitat restoration) purposes; future use of the South Tract may also include land-navigation training.

The installation of Anti-Terrorist/Force Protection Measures is a currently occurring project on Fort Benning and consists of the construction of an enhanced physical security perimeter barrier around the Post’s four cantonment areas to include either fence, guard rail, or utilization of existing natural barriers, such as streams and steep ridges, and construct permanent access control points at the Post’s seven entry points. Drainage for perimeter roads and erosion control measures will be required, in addition to protective lighting at the seven access control points. An EA and Finding of No Significant Impact were prepared for this project and are available for review at the EMD. Approximate size of the overall project area is 20 to 25 acres.

The Barracks Project is located along Dixie Road, Main Post, Fort Benning. The new barracks will be located across from the existing Easley and McAndrews ranges. The project will also include the demolition of six existing buildings. An EA and Finding of No Significant Impact were prepared for this project and are available for review at the EMD. Approximate size of the overall project area is 30 to 35 acres.

The Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) will be constructed at the D13 area on Fort Benning. The DMPRC will provide a state-of-the-art range facility for conducting advanced gunnery exercises in a realistic training environment. Support facilities associated with the optimal standard design for the DMPRC will be located on an adjacent area. The DMPRC design includes as many as 22 water crossings (average dimensions: 350 feet long by 29 feet wide each), and some vegetation removal on the construction site is required. The DMPRC will be constructed on approximately 4,942 acres. An EIS was prepared for this project and is available for review at the EMD.

Construction of the new infantry museum will occur on the land lying between South Lumpkin and Fort Benning roads on the Post’s border with the City of Columbus. The existing museum, located on Baltzell Avenue, Main Post, Fort Benning, would be reutilized in another manner, but will not be demolished. An EA and Finding of No Significant Impact have been prepared for this project and are available for review at the EMD. Approximate size of the overall project area is 20 to 30 acres. Lastly, a communications tower is being constructed in the South Harmony Church area, west of Cusseta Road and south of El Caney Road.
In Columbus, safety improvements to the highway interchange at I-185/U.S. 280 (to the north of Fort Benning) are currently underway and consist of reconstructing the interchange at I-185 and U.S. 280. Safety improvements also include removing and replacing guardrails and possibly installing medians along 10.5 miles of U.S. 280. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5 to 10 acres.

5.2 Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions within the ROI

5.2.1 Fort Benning Community

Several construction projects are planned for implementation on Fort Benning proper during the same timeframe as this EA. Some of the projects have been previously identified in the Post’s Master Plan and have been preliminarily assessed for environmental impacts via the Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) process; however, each project is still pending final approval and subsequent compliance with NEPA, except as indicated below. The projects determined to have the potential to impact the ROIs are listed below. Fiscal Year (FY) refers to the period between 1 October and 30 September of each year and is the time period the Army uses for budget phases.

- **Barracks Replacement, Kelley Hill, Phase III (FY05).** Work would consist of the demolition of existing buildings (9043, 9046, 9047, 9053, 9054, 9055, 9057, 9058, and 9074), the construction of new facilities, and landscaping around the new facilities in the Kelley Hill area of Fort Benning. Approximate size of the overall project area is 10 to 15 acres.

- **Receptee Barracks (FY08).** Work would consist of the construction of additional barracks, a dining facility, soldiers’ community center, and physical training building with a running track at Sand Hill. The project would also include the demolition of the existing dining facility. Approximate size of the overall project area is 10 to 15 acres.

- **Infantry Squad Battle Course (FY05).** Work would include the conversion of an existing Fort Benning range (Galloway Range) into an Infantry Squad Battle Course (ISBC) and would include the removal/replacement and upgrading of existing targetry, the construction of associated support facilities, the demolition of currently existing temporary buildings on site, and associated utility placement. An EA and Finding of No Significant Impact were prepared for this project and are available for review at the EMD. Approximate size of the overall project area is 180 to 190 acres.

- **Infantry Platoon Battle Course (FY06).** Work would consist of the construction of a new Infantry Platoon Battle Course (IPBC) in the A12 portion of Fort Benning and would include tree clearing, grading, cut-and-fill, construction of the range and target firing area, and placement of targetry, in addition to the construction/emplacement of support facilities, access roads and trails, and associated utilities. Approximate size of the overall project area is 1,000 acres.

- **Ammunition Supply Point Expansion (FY08).** Work would consist of the construction of two aboveground general storage facilities, 11 earth-mounded ammunition storage igloos with associated loading platforms, two small quantity ammunition huts, and ammunition surveillance building, and forklift storage/recharge facilities at the existing Ammunition Supply Point (ASP)
on Fort Benning. Work would also include the demolition of 19 structures currently existing within the Ammunition Supply Point compound. Approximate size of the overall project area is 10 to 15 acres.

- **Direct Support/General Support Consolidated Maintenance Facility (FY08).** Work would consist of constructing an approximately 112,000-square foot equipment maintenance complex for the DOL. The Direct Support/General Support (DS/GS) Consolidated Maintenance Facility would be located in the southwest quadrant of U.S. 280/27 and First Division Road. Approximate size of the overall project area is 10 to 15 acres.

- **Rehabilitation of North/South Maneuver Corridors (FY undetermined; pending funding approval).** Work would consist of the rehabilitation of two existing maneuver corridors in the north and three existing maneuver corridors in the south for training utilization by the 3rd Brigade/3rd Infantry of Fort Benning. The areas are contained within the Oscar 1-15 training compartments in the north and the D2-16, L3, E3-4, and J6-7 training compartments in the south. These are existing maneuver areas that would have erosion control and soil stabilization measures conducted, in addition to selective thinning, in order to more fully support maneuvers by the mechanized vehicles. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5,000 acres.

- **Combined Club Facility (FY undetermined; pending funding approval).** Work would consist of the demolition of the existing Follow Me Golf Course Clubhouse, construction of a new clubhouse to contain the combined functions of the Golf Course Club and Officer’s Club, and the redevelopment of the existing Follow Me Golf Course. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5 to 10 acres.

- **Digital Multi Purpose Training Range (also known as Hastings Range Upgrade; FY09 project, in planning phase only).** Work would consist of upgrading the existing Hastings Range to a DMPTR; would include removal/replacement and upgrading existing targetry; expansion of the existing tank trails, construction of associated support facilities, the demolition of currently existing temporary buildings on site, and associated utility placement. Approximate size of the overall project area is 100 to 150 acres.

- **National Guard Pre-Ranger Complex Expansion; project in planning phase.** The National Guard Pre-Ranger Complex is located within the South Harmony Church Area. The National Guard proposes to establish an area south of First Division Road that would be used for field training exercises.

- **Child Development Center; project in planning phase.** Construction of a child development center designed for children ages 6 to 10 is proposed and would have capacity for 310 children for before and after school as well as summer and other no school days. This facility would replace the 70-year old Patch School, which has the capacity of 190 children. The Patch School cannot be expanded to support 120 additional spaces and the building needs costly repairs. However, the Patch School would be retained and reassigned to another activity/agency on Fort Benning. The overall project area is anticipated to cover 3 to 5 acres.

- **Operational Readiness Barracks Complex (Long-range future project; project in planning phase).** A battalion-sized barracks complex to support current Reserve training missions (annual training) and supplement CONUS Replacement Center is proposed. The proposed capacity of the open bay barracks is 1,200 Soldiers (at 72 square feet per soldier) with a maximum capacity of 1,440 soldiers (at 60 square feet per soldier). The project also includes a dining facility with a 1,000 person capacity and an arms storage facility in accordance with Army standards.

- **Central Issue Facility; project in planning phase.** Expansion of the existing Central Issue Facility on Main Post and construction of an annex in the Harmony Church Cantonment area is being proposed to begin in FY05. The existing Central Issue Facility (Building 2386) has
exceeded its maximum storage capability due to Global War on Terrorism requirements. Tents are currently leased to store organizational clothing and individual equipment items, which is a security risk to the inventory stored in the tents.

- **Army Transformation at Fort Benning (Long-range future project; project in planning phase).** The 3rd Infantry Division is currently undergoing a major reorganization as part of the Army transformation process. The Division’s three Brigades were divided into four smaller units (U.S. Army Forces Command 2004). While no plans currently exist that would affect any other units at Fort Benning, the Post must prepare for this contingency and comply separately with environmental planning requirements. Approximately 400 soldiers are expected to arrive at Fort Benning in the fall of 2005 and will become part of the 3rd Brigade of the 3rd Infantry Division. The Kelley Hill cantonment area supports the 3rd Brigade.

A more thorough evaluation of the ASP Expansion, IPBC, and the Rehabilitation of Maneuver Corridors will be conducted via separate EAs or other appropriate NEPA actions for each project; the other listed projects are in the preliminary planning phases only, but will undergo NEPA evaluation in future documents. Other actions on Fort Benning, such as road and tank trail maintenance, range and building maintenance, building renovations, unit motor pool maintenance, troop training, and routine airfield activities, would continue in an ongoing manner on an annual basis. These projects/actions are assessed for potential environmental impacts on a case-by-case basis via the NEPA process.

### 5.2.2 Columbus-Buena Vista-Phenix City Community

The projects listed below are those determined to have the potential for moderate adverse impacts to resources within the ROI. The projects identified, but not included for study in this document, may be viewed in the Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Improvement Plan, which is available for review at the DPW.

- **Oxbow Meadows and Marina, Lumpkin Road, Columbus, Georgia (FY undetermined; tentatively scheduled to begin within the next 2 to 3 years).** Work would consist of the further development of the Oxbow Meadows Environmental Learning Center by creating additional outdoor classrooms, a series of walking trails, a series of hiking trails, and pavilion, and the construction (to include dredge and fill) of a 350-slip capacity marina. Approximate size of the overall project area is 10 to 15 acres.

- **Phenix City Riverwalk Phase II, Phenix City, Alabama (FY undetermined).** Work would consist of the construction of a hiking/biking trail between the 13th and 14th Street bridges in Phenix City. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5 to 10 acres.

- **Alternative Transportation System, Phase II, North Riverwalk, Columbus, Georgia (FY undetermined; scope of work decision pending implementation of Chattahoochee River Restoration Project, below).** Work would consist of continuing to construct the hiking/biking trail (Riverwalk) northward along the Chattahoochee River from 12th Street to 14th Street. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5 to 10 acres.

- **Widening/Improvements to Buena Vista Road, Columbus, GA (FY07).** Work would consist of widening and reconstructing 1.15 miles of an existing two- and four-lane road to a four
through-lane system with turn lanes and medians, as required. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5 to 10 acres.

- **Widening/Improvements to St. Mary’s Road, Columbus, GA (FY05).** Work would consist of widening 0.71 miles of a two-lane road to a three- and four-lane system, with intersection improvements as needed. Approximate size of the overall project area is 5 to 10 acres.

- **Chattahoochee River Restoration (FY05).** Work would consist of breaching the Eagle-Phenix Dam and the City Mills Dam along the Chattahoochee River, in order to restore the historic and natural flow of water along this portion of the river, which extends from just north of the City of Columbus and down to its most southern edge. Approximate size of the project area is 2.5 miles (approximately 35 acres).

Another issue of concern with the potential to adversely affect the overall ROI is the Tri-State Water Compact, a disagreement between Georgia, Alabama, and Florida concerning withdrawals of water and public usage from the Chattahoochee-Flint-Appalachicola river systems. The Chattahoochee River originates in the Blue Ridge Mountains of the Appalachian Highlands of northeast Georgia, where it flows southwesterly for 120 miles before turning south and flowing approximately 200 miles along the Georgia and Alabama borders, and a small part of the Florida border. The Flint River includes Blackshear Dam and Lake, Flint River Dam, and Lake Worth. The river originates south of Atlanta in Georgia’s Piedmont Province and flows southerly to the upper Coastal Plain, where it joins the Chattahoochee River in Lake Seminole to form the Appalachian River. The Appalachian River includes the USACE-operated Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam and Lake Seminole along its length. The river lies entirely within the Coastal Plan along the 180 miles of its length and flows south across northwest Florida from the Georgia to Appalachian Bay in Florida.

### 5.3 Cumulative Effects

Preliminary analysis indicated that the potential direct environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with the preferred alternative are minor, while there would be no anticipated cumulative effect to environmental justice and protection of children. In general, the construction, operation, and maintenance of the new AAFES facility at the preferred alternative site would have no significant adverse cumulative effects. During construction, effects to resources such as air quality, noise, and wildlife would be short-term and temporary. However, when the construction of the AAFES shopping center is analyzed together with past, ongoing, and potential future actions there is potential to combine with other construction projects on-Post to result in a short-term localized cumulative effect. However, because AAFES would be implementing measures such as utilizing proper equipment; implementing BMPs to lessen air quality and noise impacts; and, would be adhering to existing standard operating procedures and other guidance in place at Fort Benning, it is anticipated to result in no or minor incremental impacts and would not be cumulatively significant.
5 Cumulative Impacts

5.3.1 Socioeconomics

The threshold level of significance for socioeconomic resources is the potential for the project to result in a substantial population increase, displace residents, or result in a substantial change in employment or income.

The Proposed Action, together with past, ongoing, and potential future actions, would be expected to result in a positive minor cumulative effect to the surrounding local economy as well as the Fort Benning economy. Because of the increase in the range of goods and services provided by the facility coupled with the sale of tax-free goods, the facility would be more competitive with surrounding shopping sites, which is expected to increase the customer base by approximately 2,000 customers per day. The facility would also be improved structurally and would eliminate the operating space deficiency. Therefore, minor positive cumulative impacts are anticipated from the implementation of the Proposed Action.

5.3.2 Water Resources

The threshold level of significance for water resources is the potential of the project to cause substantial changes in wetlands functions, groundwater or surface water flows, increased risk of flooding, the potential to violate an applicable water quality standard for protection of fish and wildlife, or degradation of a water body used as a potable water source.

Construction projects that disturb soils have the greatest potential to affect water quality if sediments are washed into water courses. In particular, the construction of the ISBC, IPBC, and DMPTTR have the potential for minor to moderate adverse effects to wetlands and water quality within the Fort Benning ROI; and the development of the marina at the Oxbow Learning Center would have the potential for moderate adverse effects within the ROI. The rehabilitation of the Maneuver Corridors on Fort Benning would result in positive effects to wetlands, due to the erosion control and soil stabilization measures’ potential for reducing sedimentation into adjacent wetland areas. Adherence to applicable federal, State, and local laws and following the guidelines identified in the USACE Nationwide Permit and the ES&PC would help minimize the potential for adverse cumulative effects. Therefore, no cumulative effects to water resources are expected.

5.3.3 Noise

The threshold level of significance for noise is the increase of Zone III (incompatible) noise contours where sensitive noise receptors (i.e., residences, hospitals, libraries) are located. During construction of the AAFES facility, short-term localized noise would increase; however, the impact would be minimized by the usage of appropriately maintained equipment and limiting construction to
daylight hours. This would not result in incompatible noise activities to sensitive noise receptors located within Zone 1.

Operation of the facility would result in minor long-term adverse impacts to noise. The increase in noise levels would result primarily due to the proposed increase in the customer base at the new shopping facility and the associated increase in the number of deliveries. When compared to existing noise levels, the increase in noise levels associated with the increased traffic activity would be expected to add a minimal increase to existing ambient noise levels within the project area, resulting in a long-term minor adverse effect to noise levels within the immediate project area. However, when analyzing cumulative effects consideration was given to other noise contributors and the potential to result in a cumulative effect to the overall area. Because the other identified long-term noise contributors are a significant distance from the preferred alternative site (Lawson Air Field, approximately 4.8 miles, and Pierce Range, approximately 1.3 miles), the preferred alternative would result in no cumulative effects to the noise environment.

### 5.3.4 Air Quality

The threshold level of significance for air quality has been set at the same threshold used for new stationary sources for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) of air quality within a region. While this threshold is used for stationary sources, it provides a reasonable measure of the impact of a Proposed Action for air quality evaluation purposes. The sources of emissions related to this project are mobile sources and stationary source emissions, which are not likely to change as a result of this action.

If numerous construction projects were to occur concurrently with the site preparation and construction work associated with the Proposed Action there could be a short-term, localized cumulative effect to air quality. Increase in PM would be most prevalent because these activities would include ground disturbance and travel over unpaved surfaces (fugitive dust – PM 10) as well as increased traffic (combustion emissions PM 2.5). Although it is not possible to quantify the potential additive impact of future potential projects with the current project, the resultant cumulative effects would not be expected to significantly degrade the air quality in the area, but may result in minor negative cumulative impacts.

### 5.3.5 Earth Resources

The threshold level for earth resources (i.e., soils, topography, and geology) is any ground disturbance or other activities that would violate applicable federal or State laws and regulations, such as the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, and the potential for Notices of Violation for the
failure to receive applicable state permits, such as the NPDES construction permit under the Georgia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, prior to initiating the Proposed Action.

Many of the projects (such as highway improvements, future operational facilities, new barracks, and other construction-related projects) occurring within the ROI would cause ground disturbance. These activities increase the potential for soil erosion if stabilization were not to occur. However, Fort Benning applies several BMPs (including those noted in Section 4.3) that would minimize soil disturbance and actively prevent the potential for erosion and other types of soil degradation. With the application of these types of BMPs, soil loss would be limited to short-term effects that would result in minor cumulative adverse effects.

**5.3.6 Infrastructure and Utilities**

If numerous construction projects were to occur concurrently with the site preparation and construction work associated with the Proposed Action there could be a cumulative effect to transportation. During construction of the Proposed Action, traffic volume would increase slightly in the project area due to on-road use by construction equipment, construction workforce vehicles, and vehicles delivering construction materials. To minimize the minor adverse effects to the transportation system, the contractor would implement mitigation measures as identified in Section 4.8. There would be no anticipated measurable increase in utility demand during the construction of the Proposed Action.

Operation of this facility would result in an increase in demand of utility services; however, existing utility service providers have capacity to adapt to the cumulative demands associated with the proposed action and other projects. Distribution systems to bring those services to project sites may be required. Environmental disturbances associated with extending utility services to new locations would be addressed in future NEPA documents; however, at this time, no significant adverse cumulative effects are anticipated with the proposed action. Traffic during the operation of the Proposed Action would increase; however would only be a small percentage. Therefore, these effects associated with both the construction and the operation of the Proposed Action would result in no cumulative impacts.

**5.3.7 Hazardous Materials and Wastes**

The threshold level of significance for hazardous materials and wastes is the potential to substantially affect human health, safety, or the environment.

The majority of the projects would only require the use of pesticides, petroleum, oils, and lubricants in association with construction and equipment maintenance activities. Fort Benning would continue to implement their BMPs for hazardous materials and waste use and adhere to
rigorous regulations for the use, storage, handling, analysis, and disposal of such wastes and comply with applicable requirements. Therefore, no cumulative adverse impacts from hazardous materials and waste would be anticipated.

### 5.3.8 Biological Resources

The threshold level of significance for federally protected species would include the disruption of normal behavior patterns or disturbance to habitat at a level that would substantially impact the Post’s ability to either avoid jeopardy or to conserve and recover the species. The threshold level of significance for vegetation is removal in amounts that will alter the habitat in a manner detrimental to the species that live there.

Construction of the barracks on Main Post, Sand Hill and Kelly Hill, ISBC, IPBC, DMPRC, DMPTR; and the development of Oxbow Meadows and the marina along with the continued development of the North Tract would have the potential for minor to moderate adverse effects to biological resources (i.e., federal or state listed protected species or their habitat) within the Fort Benning area. Continued adherence to INRMP guidance (US Army 2001) in the siting and construction of new facilities would assure the avoidance of significant cumulative impacts. Furthermore, the continued implementation of conservation measures for the RCW on Fort Benning in consultation with the USFWS, as needed for current and future projects will help to ensure that the RCW population remains on track towards recovery or increases. Minimal RCW habitat would be lost as a result of the Proposed Action. Overall, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in no potential for incremental impacts from ongoing activities and no cumulative adverse impacts to biological resources.

### 5.3.9 Cultural Resources

The threshold level of significance for cultural resources is the violation of applicable Federal laws and regulations, such as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and others.

No incremental impacts to cultural resources in association with the proposed action are anticipated. Once the proposed PX facility is completed, Soldiers’ Support Services would be relocated to the vacated, existing PX facility (Holloway 2000). Soldiers’ Support Services is currently located in a group of World War II-era structures within an older part of the Post. Once Soldiers’ Support Services moves, the old structures formerly used by Soldiers’ Support Services would be demolished (Holloway 2000), which would be considered an adverse effect of the project. The
demolition of these structures would be covered under the *1986 Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement* (USDOD 1986). Other projects in the ROI would follow applicable cultural resource requirements and procedures. Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed Action at the preferred alternative site would have no affect on any resources eligible for listing on the NRHP, nor would any cumulative adverse impacts occur in conjunction with past, present, or foreseeable projects. If during construction, previously unidentified cultural resources were discovered, activities at that site would be stopped and the Fort Benning archaeologist would be notified. Coordination with all the appropriate Federal, state, and local agencies as well as American Indian Tribes, would be conducted to determine the importance of the site and how it should be treated before construction activities at the site resume.

### 5.3.10 Land Use

The threshold level of significance for land use includes evaluating consistency with land use plans, and compatibility with existing and future surrounding land uses.

New development would preclude the use of land for other purposes; however, historically land within Fort Benning has undergone many changes. This pattern is likely to continue. The projects identified as potentially occurring within the reasonably foreseeable future are compatible with existing and historic military land uses. Therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts to land use are anticipated with the Proposed Action.

### 5.3.11 No-Action Alternative

The implementation of Alternative 8, the no-action alternative, would result in no additional construction activities. Additionally, the no-action alternative would allow for the continued operation of the existing PX and Commissary at Fort Benning. As a result, there would be no anticipated change to the baseline cumulative effects.
6 Conclusions and Recommendations

A new AAFES shopping center is needed to replace the existing facility, which is outdated, located in confined space, highly congested, and too small to adequately serve the customer base. The preferred alternative site and other alternative sites have been evaluated in this EA with respect to numerous natural, cultural, physical, and socioeconomic resources. The following conclusions have been drawn from the findings of the EA.

6.1 Alternative 8: The No-Action Alternative (Status quo)

Under Alternative 8, the no-action alternative (status quo), a new shopping facility would not be constructed on the Post to serve the military and associated eligible shopping population. The military community that shops at Fort Benning would continue to use the existing facility that is limited in space and offers an unsatisfactory range of services and merchandise. The no-action alternative would not meet the needs of the military community, who may be forced to shop for some goods and services at commercial establishments located off the Post. This would be both inconvenient and inefficient for active military personnel, their families, and other shoppers eligible to shop at the PX. Although this alternative would have lesser environmental impacts than the Proposed Action, it would not meet Fort Benning community needs and, therefore, is not recommended.

6.2 Alternative 7: The Preferred Alternative

Alternative 7, the preferred site, includes construction of a new 218,000-square foot building for use by authorized individuals at Fort Benning. The Proposed Action would consist of construction, operation, and maintenance of a shopping center containing a main store and a food court with popular fast food establishments. Other services in the proposed facility would include a barbershop, beauty shop, pharmacy, alterations shop, optometrist/eye care office, flower shop, one-hour photo store, trophy shop, watch repair, nutrition center, shoe store, and amusement arcade. This facility
would satisfy the shopping needs of the Fort Benning community and the needs of other shoppers eligible to shop as this complex. It would eliminate the need for military personnel and their family from having to shop at commercial establishments off the Post.

After evaluating the alternatives, Alternative 7 meets the environmental and siting criteria for the siting of the Proposed Action. Implementation of this alternative would require the long-term conversion of 18.25 acres of undeveloped land to a shopping mall facility. Long-term localized adverse noise impacts would occur during the operation of the facility resulting from increased deliveries and vehicular traffic; however, these would be minor due to limiting construction to daylight hours. Minor impacts during construction activities would include localized noise impacts and also increased vehicular traffic associated with construction activities. Short-term moderate adverse construction impacts may result in an increase in soil erosion resulting in moderate adverse impacts to soils. Furthermore, recent wetland delineations concluded that 0.15 acres of wetlands exist on the preferred site of the Proposed Action, of which 0.114 acres would be impacted. Additionally, a total of 26 linear feet of intermittent stream would be impacted by the Proposed Action. Based on their review of the wetland delineation (see Appendix A), the USACE granted AAFES approval to use Nationwide Permit #18 for this project. Also, vegetation would be removed including a very small patch of RCW habitat that is not currently associated with an active cluster. The effects that the preferred alternative would have on the resources identified above are not considered to be significant. Mitigation measures would include the strict adherence to existing plans (SPCC, SWPPP, IHWMP, and ISCP), guidelines, and permit requirements (NPDES and USACE). In addition, during construction activities, proper equipment would be used to minimize noise and air emissions. Furthermore, construction vehicles would be parked off-street, construction workers would be encouraged to carpool, and truck trips would be scheduled at intervals over the entire working day, thus avoiding peak-hour traffic times. Positive impacts are expected to some categories of utilities and socioeconomics.

Based on the findings of this EA, the preferred alternative of constructing the AAFES shopping facility at the site across from the existing PX/commissary would not result in significant impacts to any natural, cultural, physical, or socioeconomic resource, and would be preferred over the No-Action Alternative.
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List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWD</td>
<td>coarse wood debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGPS</td>
<td>differential Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; E</td>
<td>Ecology and Environment, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-185</td>
<td>Interstate 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetlands Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHW</td>
<td>ordinary high water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA, NRCS</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) was retained by Fort Benning to conduct an identification of Waters of the United States, including wetlands, on a site proposed for shopping center construction. The project was tasked in order to locate all waters/wetlands in the potential area of impact to help plan the shopping center design layout for minimizing impacts.

The project is located in the northwestern portion of the U.S Army’s Military Reservation at Fort Benning, Georgia. The site is east of U.S. Interstate 185 (I-185) at the 1-mile marker, and adjacent to the existing commissary facility (Attachment A, Figure 1). The site is approximately 50 acres in size; however, the project “footprint” will only impact 18.25 acres of the site. The surveyed area extends beyond the specified project boundaries to ensure that all jurisdictional areas within reasonable proximity to the project are assessed. In addition, the boundary extension will allow project engineers various options in minimizing the potential impacts to jurisdictional areas.

2.0 Project Area Description

The site is located on Fort Benning property within the limits of the main base area. The property has been disturbed by apparent past logging activities and utilities installation. Numerous logging roads and two utility line corridors cross the surveyed area. Access to the property is via an existing unimproved road from Marne Road, across the road from the existing commissary facility.

The site is situated atop a ridge running north/south, with significant variation in local elevation (Attachment A, Figure 2). According to United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic elevations, the lowest elevation of the area surveyed is 250 feet, while the highest elevation is 368 feet. The site is nearly level along the ridge top. Conversely, ridge slopes range up to 30% grade. Numerous “logging” roads exist along ridge contours and atop the ridge.

2.1 Project Area Vegetation

The project site is located in northern Chattahoochee County within 1 mile of the Upatoi River. Vegetation differs between surveyed extents due to varying elevations across the site. Few areas have been altered from the natural land cover. Aside from two small cleared corridors, the site remains comprised of forested and herbaceous areas. The forested areas occur in the lower elevations and in areas not cleared by logging atop the ridge. Deciduous hardwoods occur in the lower elevations where sunlight is less plentiful. Higher topographic areas exhibit more evergreen pine and associated herbaceous vegetation.
Deciduous area tree species include red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tupelo (*Nyssa* spp.), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), yellow poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), sweetbay magnolia (*Magnolia Virginiana*), silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), umbrella magnolia (*Magnolia tripetala*), bayberry (*Myrica cerifera*), willow oak (*Quercus phellos*), water oak (*Quercus nigra*), white oak (*Quercus alba*), Southern red oak (*Quercus falcata*), sasafrass (*Sassafras albicidum*), American holly (*Ilex opaca*), mountain laurel (*Kalmia latifolia*), and river birch (*Betula nigra*). Other non-tree species include Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense*), common greenbriar (*Smilax rotundifolia*), summer grape (*Vitis aestivalis*), needle rush (*Juncus effuses*), cinnamon fern (*Osmunda cinnamomea*), signal grass (*Brachiaria platyphylla*), Virginia creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*), and poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*).

The ridge top includes species such as loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), shortleaf pine (*Pinus echinata*), white oak, Southern red oak, red maple, rough-leaf dogwood (*Cornus asperifolia*), cedar elm (*Ulmus crassifolia*), pin oak (*Quercus palustris*), and yellow hawthorn (*Crataegus flava*). Groundcover species in this area include Southern dewberry (*Rubus trivialis*), groundsel (*Senecio* spp.), sagegrass (*Artemisia* spp.), Bahia grass (*Paspalum nodatum*), and annual ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*).

### 2.2 Project Area Hydrology

The project area is located in a high-relief area typical of west-central Georgia. Slopes range from nearly flat to 30% on ridge slopes. Due to the relatively high relief, storm run-off is rapid and well drained.

The project lies within the Middle Chattahoochee-Walter F. George Rese Watershed. Water bodies within the watershed include the Chattahoochee River, Upatoi Creek, and Choctawhatchee River. All streams that lie within this watershed are considered non-tidally influenced. The relatively high watershed relief promotes rapid water movement. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) rates the watershed as having “Better Water Quality and low vulnerability” to pollutants (EPA 2003).

The ridge upon which the site is located drains into two unnamed intermittent streams located on the ridge’s eastern and western sides. These are tributaries of intermittent Hamlet Creek. During the investigation, the two unnamed tributaries and Hamlet Creek had a definite perceivable flow. Hamlet Creek flows northwestward into Upatoi Creek, which eventually flows westward into the Chattahoochee River.

The two unnamed tributaries that are within the surveyed area are fed by direct precipitation, groundwater seepage, and return flow. During times of high evapotranspiration and low
precipitation, most flow comes from groundwater and return flow. The two streams have a small watershed themselves, due to the hilly nature and numerous divides within the region. For the remainder of this report, the unnamed stream to the ridge’s east is referred to as ‘Area A,’ while the unnamed stream to the ridge’s west is referred to as ‘Area B.’

The upper extent of Area A exhibits no defined stream channel south of the utility corridor that traverses the survey area. Given no defined channel, the upper extents are broad and show signs of long periods of standing water. As Area A progresses down slope, a defined channel begins to form. The upper extent of Area B, within the surveyed area, has two defined stream channels with several return flow seepage points. Further down slope, Area B also exhibits a well-defined channel. Areas A and B are described in greater detail in Section 4.0.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Q3 Digital Flood Map, Chattahoochee County, Georgia (FEMA 2000), was used to assess the potential that any of the surveyed areas lay within the floodplain. The entire project site is located within Zone X, defined as “outside 100-year floodplain.” No project components are located inside the mapped floodplains.

2.3 Project Area Soils

Soils in the northern half of the surveyed area fall in the general classification of Troup-Cowarts-Nankin. The predominant soil on site is Nankin sandy clay loam. The soil covering the southern half of the surveyed area is Ruston sand (United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service [USDA, NRCS 1999a]).

Nankin soils consist of very deep, well-drained, moderately slowly permeable soils that formed in stratified loamy and clayey marine sediments. On the proposed site, the soils are primarily highly plastic flint clay. These soils are heavily eroded with slopes of 18 to 25%. In some areas, erosion has removed the surface layer. These soils are found at depths of 10 to 20 feet on the proposed site with exposure on the western, northern, and eastern slopes.

Ruston series soils consist of very deep, well-drained, moderately permeable soils. On the proposed site, they are comprised of a surface layer of loose to firm, fine-to-medium sand overlaying a loose to very dense, fine-to-coarse sand. These sand layers are from 10 to 20 feet deep (Hill-Staton Engineers 1999). Groundwater depth in the area is from 11 to 14 feet below existing ground surface, atop the ridge plateau, as determined by soil borings (Hill-Staton Engineers 1999).

The northeastern quarter of the proposed site is classified by the Post Land Management Division as loamy Udorthents. These are upland soils that have been modified by cutting,
filling, and shaping in the construction of helicopter landing sites and firing ranges for small arms and light explosives (USDA 1997). An existing borrow pit is also located on the central plateau of the proposed action site.

Soil on the proposed project site is mapped by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS; now the NRCS) and interpreted into a digital format (STATSGO) by the EPA.

### 3.0 Wetlands Delineation Procedures

The wetland investigation involved identification and preliminary delineation of Waters of the United States, including wetlands, which are subject to United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. From April 29 through May 2, 2003, E & E performed field identification and a preliminary delineation survey at the site. Procedures followed the routine determination methodology established in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987).

#### 3.1 Preliminary Data Gathering

Prior to on-site investigation, a preliminary review aided the field identification effort in locating and documenting potential jurisdictional waters. This review included:

- USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps for Fort Benning and Columbus, Georgia (USGS 1974),
- FEMA Q3 Flood Data, Chattahoochee County, Georgia (FEMA 2000);
- EPA STATSGO Digital Soils Information, Chattahoochee County, Georgia; and
- National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps, Columbus and Fort Benning, Georgia (digital format; United States Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] 1980).

Potential jurisdictional areas were identified and preliminary delineations performed according to the USACE wetlands delineation manual “Section D - routine determination, Subsection 2 - onsite inspection necessary, areas greater than five acres in size” (Environmental Laboratory 1987). This method requires systematic transects to adequately characterize the site. Several baselines, which parallel the major watercourse of Hamlet Creek through the survey area and run east-west, were established. The southernmost transect was located approximately 400 feet south of the utility corridor, while the northernmost transect occurred on the south side of Hamlet Creek. Given the site’s varying topography, transects were located in the lower elevations where jurisdictional criteria were more likely to occur. At each vegetative community change, an observation was made to assess whether the location exhibited the three criteria needed for wetlands determination (Environmental Laboratory 1987). Formal data evaluation sheets were not completed for those areas where wetland criteria were not evident.
3.2 Field Identification

The field identification included establishing discrete locations where the wetlands delineation procedures were conducted to determine if the three mandatory wetland criteria were met (i.e., hydrophytic vegetation, wetland hydrology and hydric soil). Four wetland locations were identified and subsequent routine wetland data forms were completed for each (Attachment A, Figures 3 & 4). These forms document site-specific information, as specified by the USACE’s wetlands delineation manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987).

The indicator status of dominant and non-dominant plant species at each location was determined from the “National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands: Southeast (Region 4)” (Reed 1988). This information was used to determine if the composition of the dominant plant community satisfied the hydrophytic vegetation parameter. Direct observations of inundation, saturation, and/or other field indicators of wetland hydrology (e.g., water marks, drift lines, oxidized rhizospheres, sediment deposits and drainage patterns in wetlands) were used to determine if the wetland hydrology parameter was satisfied.

Soil samples were obtained to depths generally extending to 14 inches. Observed soil profiles were described and compared with soil series descriptions mapped as occurring on the project site according to the NRCS. Soil color was determined using the Munsell Color Chart (Kollmorgen Instruments Corporation 1988) and compared to the soil survey description. These soils were then compared to a list of hydric soils of Chattahoochee County as determined by the SCS. Additionally, the observed profiles were examined for hydric soil field indicators (e.g., sulfidic odor, iron-manganese concretions, low-chroma matrix colors, mottling, etc.) to determine if the hydric soil indicator was satisfied. Each data form includes supporting rationales for decisions made relative to mandatory wetland parameters (Attachment B).

U.S. water/wetland boundaries were determined through combined observation of water source, drainage patterns, riparian vegetation, top of bank, and ordinary high water (OHW) mark. Wetland boundaries were marked with sequentially numbered Global Positioning System (GPS) positions, placed at the point where the wetland meets upland areas. Water boundaries at locations that exhibited highly incised streambeds were delineated at top of bank. Water boundaries were flagged at the OHW in instances where streambeds were not highly incised. OHW is determined by the presence of scours on banks, drift lines, stained areas on trees or posts in or near the water, and other factors. Subsequent to the marking of the identified water, each position location established within the project site was surveyed with a Trimble Pro XRS GPS receiver. The GPS receives real-time differential positional data from Earth-orbiting satellites provided by Trimble Omnistar DGPS (differential GPS) subscription service and real-time information from a nearby U.S. Coast Guard beacon in Macon, Georgia. This allows the GPS to locate a position on Earth at sub-meter accuracy.
GPS coordinates were downloaded into ArcView Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software for creating maps of delineated stream boundaries. The receiver provided locations and accurate calculations for each identified location.

# 4.0 Results of Investigation

The following section describes the results of the field survey to determine Waters of the United States, including wetlands. Following guidelines outlined in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987), four waters/wetland areas were identified within the surveyed areas described in Section 2.0 (Attachment A, Figure 2).

## 4.1 Area A

Area A is located on the eastern side of the ridge proposed for development (Attachment A, Figure 2). This jurisdictional feature is 1.42 acres in size; however, only 0.01 acres, which include 26 feet of linear stream, are predicted to be impacted by development activities. Other than one small crossing, project engineers have preserved a 25-foot or greater buffer between all project-related activities and Area A (Attachment A, Figure 5).

Area A is a linear, unnamed intermittent feature that flows north into Hamlet Creek. The feature varies in width, depth, and bed characteristics throughout its course. The headwaters of Area A have no defined stream channel, but show signs of prolonged inundation. Buttressed tupelo and watermarks are some of the hydrologic indicators present in the headwater area. A weir, which is present but not functional, is located approximately 550 feet north of Area A’s southern terminus. This weir ponded water in the upper extents, contributing the hydrologic indicators previously mentioned. Northward of the weir, a well-defined channel is present. At specific locations, the channel measures 50 feet wide and 15 feet deep; however, the average channel width and depth range from 15 to 20 feet and 3 to 4 feet, respectively.

Typical vegetation found within Area A include, but is not limited to, red maple, tupelo, sweetgum, yellow poplar, sweetbay magnolia, willow oak, sasafrass, American holly, mountain laurel, summer grape, needle rush, cinnamon fern, and signal grass.

This area is located outside the 100-year floodplain and is not found on NWI resources. Nankin sandy clay loam and Ruston sand underlie the area, which are not considered hydric by the NRCS. *In-situ* soil observations are not confirmed with map type. A description of vegetation, soils, and hydrology of various locations is provided in Attachment B, Datasheets 1-7.
4.2 Area B

Area B is located on the western side of the ridge proposed for development. This jurisdictional feature covers 1.93 acres; however, this feature will not be impacted by development activities. Project engineers have preserved a 25-foot or greater buffer between all project-related activities and Area B.

This feature is a linear, unnamed intermittent feature that flows north into Hamlet Creek. The feature varies in width, depth, and bed characteristics throughout its course. The headwaters of Area B have two moderately defined stream channels, along with many seepage areas. The two channels meet to form one defined channel south of a utility corridor that traverses the surveyed area. North of the corridor, Area B becomes a braided stream with several defined channels meandering through a 100-foot-wide swath. Approximately 300 feet north of the corridor, the channel braids combine to form one well-defined channel. Area B’s channel width does not exhibit the large span that Area A does; the approximate channel width is 15 to 20 feet. However, Area B is highly incised with depths from 20 to 25 feet. The dramatic depths are more frequent in Area B compared to Area A. Average channel depths in Area B range from 5 to 8 feet.

Typical vegetation found within Area B include red maple, tupelo, sweetgum, yellow poplar, sweetbay magnolia, silver maple, sycamore, umbrella magnolia, bayberry, willow oak, river birch, Chinese privet, needle rush, cinnamon fern, signal grass, and poison ivy.

Area B is located outside the 100-year floodplain and was not indicated on NWI resource maps. Nakin sandy clay loam and Ruston sand underlie the area, which are not considered hydric by the NRCS. *In-situ* soil observations are not confirmed with map type. A description of vegetation, soils, and hydrology of various locations are provided in Attachment B, Datasheets 8-13.

4.3 Area C

Area C lies in the surveyed area’s extreme northern extents. This jurisdictional feature is 0.08 acres in size; however, this feature will not be impacted by development activities. In addition, a 25-foot or greater buffer separates all project related activities and Area C.

This is an unmapped feature connected to Hamlet Creek between Areas A and B. The feature is highly eroded, and during the investigation no perceivable flow was observed. Channel width and depth near Hamlet Creek are 20 feet and 15 feet, respectively. The upper extent of Area C is inundated due to the presence of several inches of coarse wood debris (CWD), which impounds water, and has allowed for the propagation of hydrophytic herbaceous species in the upper extents of Area C. Area C’s vegetation is typical of that in Areas A and
B. This feature lies outside the 100-year floodplain. Descriptions of wetland criteria observations are provided in Attachment B, Datasheet 14.

4.4 Area D

Area D is a small seepage area approximately 2 feet wide and 200 feet long. The area is approximately 0.01 acres and will not be impacted by proposed development activities. In addition, a 25-foot or greater buffer separates all project related activities and Area D.

Although a small amount of water was found, no perceivable flow was observed during the investigation. The course of Area D is not easily discernable as the feature progresses downgradient; however, it is included in this delineation because it does meet the definition of a headwater and is directly connected to Area A. The area is not large enough to promote any hydrophytic species other than in the herbaceous strata. These species include needle rush and inland rush. Nakin sandy clay loam underlies the area, which is not considered hydric by the NRCS.

5.0 Conclusion

Results of the identification and delineation of Waters of the United States, including wetlands, at the project site in Chattahoochee County, Georgia, shows that the proposed project survey area contains waters/wetlands subject to USACE jurisdiction. These jurisdictional areas consist of palustrine marsh, bottomland forest, and defined stream networks associated with the Middle Chattahoochee-Walter F. George Rese Watershed. These areas meet the definition of Waters of the United States as defined in 33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §328.3. Four areas totaling 3.44 acres traverse the surveyed area. Design engineers have planned activities during construction and operation to minimize the impact on wetland areas and stream crossings within the proposed project area. Subsequently, only 0.01 acres of jurisdictional waters and 26 feet of linear stream will be impacted by development activities.

Under Nationwide Permit 39 “Residential, Commercial, and Institutional Developments” activities may not exceed a total of 0.5 acres loss of Waters of the United States, including 300 feet of linear stream channel. The activities proposed at the Fort Benning shopping center project site will impact 0.01 acres of jurisdictional waters and 26 feet of linear stream of the United States; therefore, it is requested that requirements for USACE permitting for this project fall under Nationwide Permit 39 unless directed otherwise by the USACE.

The USACE jurisdictional determination of the Waters of the United States will be required and will directly influence activities of construction and operation, which are planned to minimize impact on wetland areas and stream crossings. Subsequently, final permitting
requirements and potential mitigation will be established upon final determination by USACE.
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Dataforms
**DATA FORM**
**ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION**
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Site:</th>
<th>Ft. Benning Shopping Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner:</td>
<td>U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Michael Gertmen (E&amp;E, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>4-30-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Chattahoochee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site?** Yes [x] No [ ]

**Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)?** Yes [ ] No [x] No [x]

**Is the area a potential Problem Area?** Yes [ ] No [x] (If needed, explain on reverse.)

| Community ID: | Wetland |
| Transect ID: | Ob. Pt. 1 |
| Plot ID: | |

## VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Nyssa Sylvatica</em></td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Carex spp.</em></td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Osmunda Cinnamomea</em></td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Magnolia Virginiana</em></td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Acer Rubrum</em></td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Acer Rubrum</em></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Ilex Opaca</em></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>Kalmia Latifolia</em></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-):** 6/8 = 75%

**Remarks:**
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Very little ground cover exists, mostly very large trees.

## HYDROLOGY

**Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):**
- [x] Aerial Photographs
- [x] Other - USGS Topographic Map
- [ ] Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
- [ ] No Recorded Data Available

**Field Observations:**
- Depth of Surfasc Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: 10 (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: 5 (in.)

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

**Primary Indicators:**
- Inundated
- Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
- Water Marks
- Drift Lines
- Sediment Deposits
- Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

**Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):**
- Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
- Water-Stained Leaves
- Local Soil Survey Data
- FAC-Neutral Test
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Remarks:**
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. Secondary indicator other indicated the presence of buttressed trees, which can be an indicator of past inundation.
**SOILS (Observation Point #1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
<th>Leaf Litter</th>
<th>Sandy Clay Loam, Dark Yellowish Brown</th>
<th>Clay Loam, Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Few/Fine/Distinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Clay Loam, Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>7.5YR 2.5/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay Loam, Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- [ ] Histosol
- [ ] Histic Epipedon
- [ ] Sulfidic Oder
- [ ] Aquic Moisture Regime
- [ ] Reducing Conditions
- [ ] Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- [ ] Concretions
- [ ] High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Remarks:**
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions in upper layer while low chroma in deeper layers.

---

**WETLAND DETERMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
<th>Hydric Soils Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
<th>Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Remarks:**
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located at a low point in elevation which is consistent with this portion of the wetland.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM  
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION  
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center</th>
<th>Date: 4-30-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning</td>
<td>County: Chattahoochee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator: Michael J. Cottman (E&amp;E, Inc.)</td>
<td>State: Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the area a potential Problem Area? (if needed, explain on reverse.)</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community ID: Upland</td>
<td>Transect ID:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Vitis aestivalis</em></td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Santalum album</em></td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Pinus taeda</em></td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Ficus opaca</em></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-): 3/6 = 50%

Remarks: 
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. The vegetation is noticeably more upland variety than the point within the wetland.

HYDROLOGY

☑ Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks): 
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge 
☐ Aerial Photographs 
☑ Other - USGS Topographic Map 
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: NA (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: NA (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
- Primary Indicators:
  - Inundated
  - Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
  - Water Marks
  - Drift Lines
  - Sediment Deposits
  - Drainage Patterns in Wetlands
- Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
  - Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
  - Water-Stained Leaves
  - Local Soil Survey Data
  - FAC-Neutral Test
  - Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks: 
Wetland hydrology was not met at this location. This location does not lie within the apparent wetland area.
**SOILS (Observation Point #2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concentrations, Structure, etc.</th>
<th>Leaf Litter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Yellowish Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>10YR 5/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Very Dark Grayish Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**
- [ ] Histosol
- [ ] Histic Epipedon
- [ ] Sulfide Odor
- [ ] Aquic Moisture Regime
- [ ] Reducing Conditions
- [ ] Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- [ ] Concretions
- [ ] High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Remarks:**
Soils at this location are not considered hydric. Soils are very sandy with no organic streaking.

---

**WETLAND DETERMINATION**

|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|

**Remarks:**
All three wetland criteria are not present at this location. This area is located approximately 2 feet above Ob Pt. 1 on the side slope of the ridge.

Approved by HOUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S. Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E, Inc.)

Date: 4-30-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☒ No ☐
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes ☐ No ☒
Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes ☐ No ☒

Community ID: Wetland
Transect ID:
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 3

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carex spp.</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Osmunda cinnamomea</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smilax smithii</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-): 9/10 = 90%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Very little ground cover exists, mostly very large trees.

HYDROLOGY

☑ Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☐ Aerial Photographs
☐ Other - USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:

- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: 2 (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: 10 (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
Primary Indicators:
- Inundated
- Saturated In Upper 12 Inches
- Water Marks
- Drift Lines
- Sediment Deposits
- Drainage Patterns In Wetlands

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
- Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
- Water-Stained Leaves
- Local Soil Survey Data
- FAC-Neutral Test
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. Secondary indicator other indicated the presence of buttressed truss, which can be an indicator of past inundation.
**SOILS (Observation Point #3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
<th>Drainage Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>10YR 5/4</td>
<td>Common/Medium/Distinct</td>
<td>SOILS NOT MAPPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Very Dark Gravish Brown</td>
<td>Field Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Brownish Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Very Dark Gray</td>
<td>Confirm Mapped Type?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- [ ] Histosol
- [ ] High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Other (Explain in Remarks)
- [ ] Concretions
- [ ] Sulfdic Odor
- [ ] Aquic Moisture Regime
- [ ] Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- [ ] Reducing Conditions

**Remarks:**
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions in upper layer while low chroma in deeper layers. Dark organic streaks are present in the middle sandy layer.

---

**WETLAND DETERMINATION**

|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------|

**Remarks:**
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located at a low point in elevation at the headwater area of the wetland.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S. Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E, Inc.)

| Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? | Yes ☑ No ☐ |
| Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? | Yes ☐ No ☒ |
| Is the area a potential Problem Area? (If needed, explain on reverse.) | Yes ☐ No ☒ |

Date: 4-30-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia
Community ID: Upland
Transect ID: ________
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 4

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitis aestivalis</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sertula smallii</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus taeda</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comus floridu</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-), \( \frac{27}{7} = 29\% \)

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is not hydrophyte. The vegetation is noticeably more upland and occur past the headwater area of this wetland.

HYDROLOGY

☑ Recorded Date (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☐ Aerial Photographs
☒ Other – USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water In Pit: NA (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: NA (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
Primary Indicators:
- Inundated
- Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
- Water Marks
- Drift Lines
- Sediment Deposits
- Drainage Patterns in Wetlands
Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
- Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
- Water-Stained Leaves
- Local Soil Survey Data
- FAC-Neutral Test
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was not met at this location. This location lies beyond the headwater area of this wetland.
SOILS (Observation Point #4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>10YR 6/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Light Yellowish Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- Histosol
- Histic Epipedon
- Sulfidic Odor
- Aquic Moisture Regime
- Reducing Conditions
- Gleyed or Low-Chrome Colors
- Concretions
- High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are not considered hydric. Soils are very sandy with no organic streaking.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☒</th>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☒</th>
<th>Hydric Soils Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☒</th>
<th>Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland?</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are not present at this location. This area is located approximately 2 feet above Ob Pt. 3 on the back slope of the ridge. Just down gradient from this point Area A begins.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Site:</th>
<th>Ft. Benning Shopping Center</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>4-30-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner:</td>
<td>U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning</td>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Chattahoochee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Michael Gartman (E&amp;E, Inc.)</td>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes [x] No [ ]
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes [ ] No [x]
Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes [ ] No [x]
(Other, explain on reverse.)

Community ID: Wetland
Transect ID: _______
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 5

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brachyphyllum platyphylla</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Osmunda cinnamomea</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pinus taeda</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Quercus phellos</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FACW-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-). 8/9 = 88%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Very little ground cover exists, mostly very large trees.

HYDROLOGY

Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
- [x] Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
- [x] Aerial Photographs
- [ ] Other - USGS Topographic Map
- [ ] No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: 9 (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: 6 (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
- Primary Indicators:
  - [x] Inundated
  - [x] Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
  - [ ] Water Marks
  - [ ] Drift Lines
  - [ ] Sediment Deposits
  - [x] Drainage Patterns in Wetlands
- Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
  - [ ] Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
  - [ ] Water-Stained Leaves
  - [ ] Local Soil Survey Data
  - [ ] FAC-Neutral Test
  - [x] Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. Secondary indicator other indicated the presence of buttressed trees, which can be an indicator of past inundation. Also, very close proximity to well defined flowing stream.
SOILS (Observation Point #5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>Few/Fine/Distinct</td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 3/6</td>
<td>Few/Medium/Distinct</td>
<td>Sandy Clay, Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:
- [ ] Histosol
- [ ] Histio Epipedeon
- [ ] Sulfidic Odor
- [ ] Aquic Moisture Regime
- [x] Reducing Conditions
- [ ] Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- [ ] Concretions
- [ ] High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions throughout entire sampled profile.

---

WETLAND DETERMINATION

| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? | Yes [x] No [ ] |
| Wetland Hydrology Present?     | Yes [x] No [ ] |
| Hydric Soils Present?          | Yes [x] No [ ] |
| Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? | Yes [x] No [ ] |

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located north of the utility corridor and is part of the outwash plain of the nearby streambed.
# Data Form

**Routine Wetland Determination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Site:</th>
<th>Ft. Benning Shopping Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner:</td>
<td>U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Michael Gartmen (E&amp;E, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>4-30-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Chattahoochee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? **Yes X No □**
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? **Yes □ No X**
Is the area a potential Problem Area? **Yes □ No X**

## Vegetation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quercus phellos</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FACW-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brachiaria platyphylla</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vitis aestivalis</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Smilax smallii</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Juncus effusus</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quercus nigra</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Callicarpa americana</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FACU-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-): 6/9 = 67%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Species are influenced by apparent outwash area in which this location exists.

## Hydrology

- Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
  - Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
  - Aerial Photographs
  - Other – USGS Topographic Map
  - No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: **NA (in.)**
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: **6 (in.)**
- Depth to Saturated Soil: **6 (in.)**

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
- **Primary Indicators:**
  - Inundated
  - Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
  - Water Marks
  - Drift Lines
  - Sediment Deposits
  - Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

- **Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):**
  - Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
  - Water-Stained Leaves
  - Local Soil Survey Data
  - FAC-Neutral Test
  - Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. Very close proximity to well defined flowing stream. This location is on the outwash plain of a well defined stream.
SOILS (Observation Point #6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Name: Troup sandy loam</th>
<th>Drainage Class: Field Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Series and Phase):</td>
<td>Confirm Mapped Type? Yes ☒ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxonomy (Subgroup): thermic Grossarenic Kandicults</td>
<td>Somewhat Excessively Drained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (Inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>10YR 5/2</td>
<td>10YR 5/8</td>
<td>Few/Fine/Distinct</td>
<td>Sandy, Grayish Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- ☐ Histosol
- ☐ Histic Epipedon
- ☐ Sulfidic Odor
- ☐ Aquic Moisture Regime
- ☒ Reducing Conditions
- ☐ Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- ☐ Concretions
- ☐ High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- ☐ Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- ☐ Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- ☐ Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Remarks:**
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions throughout entire sampled profile. Soils are not mapped as hydric by the NRCS but do exhibit hydric characteristics.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soils Present?</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland?</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located north of the utility corridor and is part of the outwash plain of the nearby streambed.

Approved by HGSAC 2/992
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E, Inc.)

Date: 4-30-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☒ No ☐
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes ☐ No ☒
Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes ☐ No ☒
(if needed, explain on reverse.)

Community ID: Upland
Transsect ID: 
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 7

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vitis aestivalis</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smilax smallii</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cornus florida</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quercus phellos</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ulmus americana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-): 4/8 = 50%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. The vegetation is noticeably more upland than point 6 but is still considered dominant hydrophytic.

HYDROLOGY

Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☒ Aerial Photographs
☐ Other - USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
Depth of Free Water in Pit: NA (in.)
Depth to Saturated Soil: NA (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
Primary Indicators:
☐ Inundated
☐ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water Marks
☐ Drift Lines
☐ Sediment Deposit
☐ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
☐ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water-Stained Leaves
☐ Local Soil Survey Data
☐ FAC-Neutral Test
☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was not met at this location. This location lies approximately 3 feet above the outwash plain located near the streambed.
SOILS (Observation Point #7)

Map Unit Name: Troup loamy sand
(Series and Phase): 
Taxonomy (Subgroup): Thermic Grossarenic Hapludult

Drainage Class: Somewhat excessively drained
Field Observations: 
Confirm Mapped Type? Yes □ No X

Profile Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Clay, Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>10YR 7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay, Very Pale Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:

☐ Histosol  ☐ Concretions
☐ Histic Epipedon  ☐ High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
☐ Sulfidic Odor  ☐ Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
☐ Aquic Moisture Regime  ☐ Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
☐ Reducing Conditions  ☐ Listed on National Hydric Soils List
☐ Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors  ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are not considered hydric. Soils are very different than other locations, being they are mostly clay at this point. Nevertheless other hydric indicators were present. Soils could not be confirmed with map type.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes □ No X
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes □ No X
Hydric Soils Present? Yes □ No X

Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? Yes □ No X

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are not present at this location. This area is located approximately 3 feet above Ob Pt. 6 on the slope above the outwash area of Area A.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E Inc.)

Date: 5/1-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☑ No ☐
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes ☐ No ☑
Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes ☐ No ☑

Community ID: Wetland
Transect ID: __________
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 8

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>9. Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Osmunda cinnamomae</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cornus floridus</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vitis vinifera</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-). 7/9 = 77%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Very little ground cover exists, mostly very large trees.

HYDROLOGY

☑ Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☑ Aerial Photographs
☒ Other – USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:

- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: 8 (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: 9 (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators:
☐ Inundated
☒ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
☒ Water Marks
☐ Drift Lines
☐ Sediment Deposits
☒ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
☒ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water-Stained Leaves
☐ Local Soil Survey Data
☒ FAC-Neutral Test
☒ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. Secondary indicator other indicated the presence of buttressed tress, which can be an indicator of past inundation. This area is also located next to a seepage area that contributes to hydrologic indicators.
SOILS (Observation Point #8)

Map Unit Name (Series and Phase): SOILS NOT MAPPED
Taxonomy (Subgroup):

Drainage Class: Field Observations
Confirm Mapped Type? Yes □ No ☒

Profile Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td>Few/Medium/Distinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:
- [ ] Histosol
- [ ] Histic Epipedon
- [ ] Sulfidic Odor
- [ ] Aquic Moisture Regime
- [x] Reducing Conditions
- [ ] Glayed or Low-Chroma Colors
- [ ] Concretions
- [ ] High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- [ ] Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- [ ] Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions and glayed chroma throughout the soil profile.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☒ No ☒
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☒ No ☒
Hydric Soils Present? Yes ☒ No ☒

Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? Yes ☒ No ☒

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located at a low point in elevation which is consistent with this portion of the wetland Area B. It is very similar to the headwater area of Area A.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/22
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E, Inc.)

Date: 5-1-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☒ No ☐

Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes ☐ No ☒

Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes ☐ No ☒

Community ID: Upland
Transect ID: 
Plot ID: Ob. Pl. 9

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vitis aestivalis</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sterilex smallii</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pinus taeda</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cornus florida</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dominant Plant Species
9. Callicarpa americana
10. Liquidambar styraciflua
11. Sassafras albidum
12. 
13. 
14. 
15. 
16. 

Stratum Indicator
SS FACU-
Tree FAC+
Tree FACU

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-). 5/11 = 45%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is not hydrophytic. The vegetation is noticeably more upland variety than the point within the wetland because it does not occur in the seepage area.

HYDROLOGY

Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
- ✔ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
- ✔ Aerial Photographs
- ✔ Other - USGS Topographic Map
- ☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: NA (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: NA (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators:
- ☐ Inundated
- ☐ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
- ☐ Water Marks
- ☐ Drift Lines
- ☐ Sediment Deposits
- ☐ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
- ☐ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves
- ☐ Local Soil Survey Data
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was not met at this location. This location does not lie within the seepage area present that feeds the lower elevations of Area B.
SOILS (Observation Point #9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moisit)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moisit)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>10YR 4/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Dark Yellowish Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:
- Histosol
- Histic Epipelen
- Sulfidic Odor
- Acule Moisture Regime
- Reducing Conditions
- Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors

Concretions
- High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are not considered hydric. Soils are very sandy with no organic streaking. The soils are not under the influence of the present seepage area located a few feet to the south.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? | Yes □ No ☒ | Wetland Hydrology Present? | Yes □ No ☒ | Hydric Soils Present? | Yes □ No ☒ | Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? | Yes □ No ☒ |

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are not present at this location. This area is located approximately 10 feet north on the same topographic elevation as point 8.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E, Inc.)

Date: 5-1-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia
Community ID: Wetland

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☒ No ☐
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes ☐ No ☒
Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes ☐ No ☒
(If needed, explain on reverse.)

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carex spp.</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Betula nigra</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-). 9/10 = 90%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Many smaller species exist at this location because of the extremely wet conditions.

HYDROLOGY

Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☒ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☒ Aerial Photographs
☒ Other – USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: 9 (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: 0 (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
Primary Indicators:
☒ Inundated
☒ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
☒ Water Marks
☒ Drift Lines
☒ Sediment Deposits
☒ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
☒ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
☒ Water-Stained Leaves
☒ Local Soil Survey Data
☒ FAC-Neutral Test
☒ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. This location is in very close proximity to the streambed and occurs on an island within the braided stream network.
SOILS (Observation Point #10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
<th>Leaf Litter</th>
<th>Drainage Class: Field Observations Confirm Mapped Type? Yes ☑ No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>10YR 3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>10YR 7/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/6</td>
<td>10YR 5/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common/Medium/Distinct</td>
<td>Sandy, Strong Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 7/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Few/Fine/Prominent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:
- ☑ Histosol
- ☑ Sulfidic Odor
- ☑ Aquic Moisture Regime
- ☑ Reducing Conditions
- ☑ Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- ☑ High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- ☑ Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- ☑ Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- ☑ Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- ☑ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions and have streaking in sandy soils. The strong brown of the bottom layer is the same color present within the streambed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☒</th>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☒</th>
<th>Hydric Soils Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☒</th>
<th>Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? Yes ☑ No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located on an island between the braided stream network.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Garfman (EAE, Inc.)

Date: 5-1-03
County: Chattahoochee
State: Georgia

Community ID: Upland
Transect ID: 
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 11

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☒ No ☐
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? Yes ☐ No ☒
Is the area a potential Problem Area? Yes ☐ No ☒
(if needed, explain on reverse.)

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Cornus flordia</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pinus iseda</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quercus nigra</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-). 4/8 = 50%

Remarks: Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. The vegetation is noticeably more upland than point 10, but is still considered dominant hydrophytic.

HYDROLOGY

☒ Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☒ Aerial Photographs
☒ Other – USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
- Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
- Depth of Free Water in Pit: NA (in.)
- Depth to Saturated Soil: NA (in.)

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
Primary Indicators:
☐ Inundated
☐ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water Marks
☐ Drift Lines
☐ Sediment Deposits
☐ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands
Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
☐ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water-Stained Leaves
☐ Local Soil Survey Data
☐ FAC-Neutral Test
☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks: Wetland hydrology was not met at this location. This location lies approximately 3 feet above the braided stream network located to the west.
SOILS (Observation Point #11)

Map Unit Name (Series and Phase): SOILS NOT MAPPED
Taxonomy (Subgroup): 

Drainage Class: 
Field Observations Confirm Mapped Type? Yes ☐ No ☒

Profile Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Mois)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Mois)</th>
<th>Motile Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10YR 4/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Dark Grayish Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Yellowish Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:
- Histosol
- Histic Epipedon
- Sulfidic Odor
- Aquic Moisture Regime
- Reducing Conditions
- Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- Concretions
- High Organic Content In Surface Layer In Sandy Soils
- Organic Streaking In Sandy Soils
- Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are not considered hydric. No low chroma colors or reducing conditions were found at this location.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Present?</th>
<th>Hydric Soils Present?</th>
<th>is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are not present at this location. This location is on the east slope of the ridge approximately 2 feet above the stream network.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center
Applicant/Owner: U.S. Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning
Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&E, Inc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 5-1-03</th>
<th>County: Chattahoochee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State: Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? Yes ☑ No ☐
Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)?
Yes ☐ No ☑
Is the area a potential Problem Area?
Yes ☐ No ☑
(if needed, explain on reverse.)

Community ID: Wetland
Transect ID: 
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 12

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex spp.</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-).
5/6 = 83%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Many smaller species exist at this location because of the extremely wet conditions associated with a seepage area and the stream network.

HYDROLOGY

☑ Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☐ Aerial Photographs
☒ Other - USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Field Observations:
Depth of Surface Water: NA (in.)
Depth of Free Water in Pit: 8 (in.)
Depth to Saturated Soil: 0 (in.)

Wetland Hydrology indicators:
Primary Indicators:
☒ Inundated
☒ Saturated In Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water Marks
☐ Drift Lines
☐ Sediment Deposits
☒ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands
Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
☐ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water-Stained Leaves
☐ Local Soil Survey Data
☐ FAC-Neutral Test
☒ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. This location is in very close proximity to the streambed and a seepage area on an island within the braided stream network.
**SOILS (Observation Point #12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Name (Series and Phase):</th>
<th>SOILS NOT MAPPED</th>
<th>Drainage Class:</th>
<th>Field Observations</th>
<th>Confirm Mapped Type?</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxonomy (Subgroup):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Molt)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Molt)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
<th>Leaf Litter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>10YR 7/6</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/6</td>
<td>Few/Medium/Prominent</td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/6</td>
<td>Few/Medium/Prominent</td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Very Dark Greyish Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- Histusol
- Histic Epipedon
- Sulfidic Odor
- Aquic Moisture Regime
- Reducing Conditions
- Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors

- Concretions
- High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Remarks:**

Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions and have streaking in sandy soils. The strong brown color of mottles is the same color present within the streambed.

**WETLAND DETERMINATION**

| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? | Yes ☒ No ☐ |
| Wetland Hydrology Present?     | Yes ☒ No ☐ |
| Hydric Soils Present?          | Yes ☒ No ☐ |

Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? Yes ☒ No ☐

**Remarks:**

All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is located on an island between the braided stream network and a seepage area north of Area's 10 and 11.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center</th>
<th>Date: 5-1-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner: U.S. Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning</td>
<td>County: Chattahoochee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator: Michael Gartman (E&amp;E, Inc.)</td>
<td>State: Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site?</th>
<th>Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the area a potential Problem Area? (if needed, explain on reverse.)</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community ID: Upland
Transect ID: 
Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 13

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vitis aestivalis</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smilax glauca</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACU-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pinus taeda</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quercus nigra</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are CBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-): 3/6 = 50%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. The vegetation is noticeably more upland than point 12 but is still considered dominant hydrophytic.

HYDROLOGY

☑ Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☐ Aerial Photographs
☐ Other - USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Indicators:</th>
<th>Primary Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Observations:</td>
<td>☐ Inundated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Surface Water:</td>
<td>☐ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (in.)</td>
<td>☐ Water Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Free Water in Pit:</td>
<td>☐ Drift Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (in.)</td>
<td>☐ Sediment Deposits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth to Saturated Soil:</td>
<td>☐ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (in.)</td>
<td>☐ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Water-Stained Leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Local Soil Survey Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ FAC-Neutral Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was not met at this location. This location lies approximately 2 feet above the braided stream network located to the west.
SOILS (Observation Point #13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Name (Series and Phase): SOILS NOT MAPPED</th>
<th>Drainage Class:</th>
<th>Field Observations Confirm Mapped Type? Yes ☐ No ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxonomy (Subgroup):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (Inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Humus Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaf Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10YR 4/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, Dark Grayish Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Yellowish Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- Histosol ☐
- Histic Epipedon ☐
- Sulfidic Odor ☐
- Aquic Moisture Regime ☐
- Reducing Conditions ☐
- Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors ☐
- Concretions ☐
- High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils ☐
- Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils ☐
- Listed on Local Hydric Soils List ☐
- Listed on National Hydric Soils List ☐
- Other (Explain in Remarks) ☐

Remarks:
Soils at this location are not considered hydric. No low chroma colors or reducing conditions were found at this location. The soils at this location are identical to those of point 11, which is geographically the same distance and elevation from Area B as this location.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☒ No ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☒ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soils Present? Yes ☒ No ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are not present at this location. This location is on the east slope of the ridge to be developed approximately 2 feet above the stream network and seepage promoting hydrophytic vegetation.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
DATA FORM
ROUTINE WETLAND DETERMINATION
(1987 COE Wetlands Delineation Manual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Site: Ft. Benning Shopping Center</th>
<th>Date: 5-1-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Owner: U.S Army Military Reservation, Ft. Benning</td>
<td>County: Chattahoochee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator: Michael Garman (E&amp;E,Inc.)</td>
<td>State: Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site? | Yes □ No □ |
| Is the site significantly disturbed (Atypical Situation)? | Yes □ No □ |
| Is the area a potential Problem Area? (If needed, explain on reverse.) | Yes □ No □ |
| Community ID: Wetland | Transect ID: |
| Plot ID: Ob. Pt. 14 | |

VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Plant Species</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Juncus effusus</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carex spp.</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Betula nigra</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>FACW+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. lix opaca</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FAC+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Juncus marginatus</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Dominant Species that are OBL, FACW or FAC (excluding FAC-): 67/7 = 96%

Remarks:
Dominant vegetation at this location is hydrophytic. Many smaller species exist at this location because of the extremely wet conditions associated with a seepage area and blockage by CWD.

HYDROLOGY

Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):
☐ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge
☐ Aerial Photographs
☐ Other - USGS Topographic Map
☐ No Recorded Data Available

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
Primary Indicators:
☐ Inundated
☐ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water Marks
☐ Drift Lines
☐ Sediment Deposits
☐ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands
Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):
☐ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches
☐ Water-Stained Leaves
☐ Local Soil Survey Data
☐ FAC-Neutral Test
☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Field Observations:
Depth of Surface Water: 4 (in.)
Depth of Free Water in Pit: NA (in.)
Depth to Saturated Soil: 0 (in.)

Remarks:
Wetland hydrology was met at this location. This location is impounded by CWD from clearing activities.
SOILS (Observation Point #14)

Map Unit Name (Series and Phase): Nakin sandy clay loam

Drainage Class: Well drained

Taxonomy (Subgroup): thermic Typic Kanhapludults

Field Observations

Confirm Mapped Type? Yes ☒ No □

Profile Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (Inches)</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Matrix Colors (Munsell Moist)</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Mottle Abundance/Size/Contrast</th>
<th>Texture Concretions, Structure, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>10YR 5/3</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/5</td>
<td>10YR 5/8</td>
<td>Few/Medium/Prominent</td>
<td>Common/Fine/Distinct</td>
<td>Clayey Sand, Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- Histosol
- Histic Epipedon
- Sulfidic Odor
- Aquic Moisture Regime
- Reducing Conditions
- Gleyed or Low-Chroma Colors
- Concretions
- High Organic Content in Surface Layer in Sandy Soils
- Organic Streaking in Sandy Soils
- Listed on Local Hydric Soils List
- Listed on National Hydric Soils List
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Remarks:
Soils at this location are considered hydric. Soils exhibit reducing conditions.

WETLAND DETERMINATION

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☒ No □

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☒ No □

Hydric Soils Present? Yes ☒ No □

Is this Sampling Point Within a Wetland? Yes ☒ No □

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are present at this location. This area is a large drainage into Hamlet Creek. It exists because of a seepage area at the headwater. Standing water is the result of woody debris blocking natural flow.

Approved by HQUSACE 2/92
Attachment C

Site Photographs
Photo 1. Looking north at pine forested area on ridge plateau.

Photo 2. Looking west at utility line corridor from the ridge plateau on the surveyed area’s southern portion.
Photo 3. Looking north at ridge slopes and cleared areas.

Photo 4. Looking north at past inundated area behind weir of Area A.
Photo 5. Looking north at sandy stream bed and associated outwash wetland within Area A.

Photo 6. Looking east at buttressed trees along seepage area within Area B.
Photo 7. Looking west at sandy stream bed and adjacent ridge slope in Area A.

Photo 8. Looking south at braided stream network in the upper extents of Area B.
Photo 9. Looking north at highly incised stream channel within Area B.

Photo 10. Looking north at clay bottom stream bed within Area B.
Appendix B

Correspondence
Natural Resources Management Branch

Mr. Lee Andrews  
Acting Field Supervisor  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Building 5887  
Fort Benning, GA 31907

Dear Mr. Andrews:

Fort Benning is proposing to build a new shopping mall in the area indicated on the enclosed map (enclosure 1). This action will involve the removal of approximately 14 Red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) trees. These trees are associated with abandoned cluster AA-01. This site has been inactive for over 8 years and was deleted from management in 1998. The area is not foraging habitat for any currently active clusters and is not in the foraging circle for any inactive cluster. We believe that the removal of these trees/cluster will not adversely affect the continued existence of the RCW at Fort Benning.

We request your review and concurrence with this action. If you have any further questions, please contact Mr. Michael Barron, (706) 544-7080/7319.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John J. Brent  
Chief, Environmental Management Division

Enclosure
Conservation Branch

JAN 16 2001

Mr. Steve Parris  
Supervisory Biologist  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Bldg 5887  
Fort Benning, GA 31905

Dear Mr. Parris:

Fort Benning is proposing to construct a new Post Exchange (PX) building in Training Compartment (AA) near the current PX facility. The building footprint is 228,400 square feet. The total area of disturbance is ± 45 acres. The general location is bound by Marne Road to the south, I-185 to the west, and undeveloped forested areas and Hamlet Creek to the north and east (enclosure 1).

To date, we have had initial meetings with the contractor (URS Corporation) awarded the environmental assessment portion of the project (enclosure 2). We believe this project can be implemented, however, the proposed build out will eliminate 33.957 acres of suitable red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) foraging habitat (pine and mixed pine stands ≥ 30 years). Consequently, this disturbance may provide for some type of low level mitigation/exchange opportunity. At this time we believe this initiative will not adversely affect the continued existence of the RCW on Fort Benning.

Please find a comprehensive package of materials that describes this project (enclosure 3). We request your review and consultation for this action.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, Georgia 30605  
Phone: (706) 613-9493  Fax: (706) 613-6699

FWS Log No. 01-0592

The Service has reviewed the plans for this proposed project. Based on the information you provided, no further action is required under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act. However, if new information or changes in the project involve federally listed species, further consultation with the Service will be required.

Sandra S. Tucker, Field Supervisor  
6-12-02  
Date
Conservation Branch

JAN 16 2001

Mr. Steve Parris
Supervisory Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bldg 5887
Fort Benning, GA 31905

Dear Mr. Parris:

Fort Benning is proposing to construct a new Post Exchange (PX) building in Training Compartment (AA) near the current PX facility. The building footprint is 228,400 square feet. The total area of disturbance is ± 45 acres. The general location is bound by Marne Road to the south, I-185 to the west, and undeveloped forested areas and Hamlet Creek to the north and east (enclosure 1).

To date, we have had initial meetings with the contractor (URS Corporation) awarded the environmental assessment portion of the project (enclosure 2). We believe this project can be implemented, however, the proposed build out will eliminate 33.957 acres of suitable red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) foraging habitat (pine and mixed pine stands ≥ 30 years). Consequently, this disturbance may provide for some type of low level mitigation/exchange opportunity. At this time we believe this initiative will not adversely affect the continued existence of the RCW on Fort Benning.

Please find a comprehensive package of materials that describes this project (enclosure 3). We request your review and consultation for this action.
If you have any further questions, please contact Mr. Pete Swiderek or Mr. John Doresky at (706) 544-7077 or 7069, respectively.

Sincerely,

John J. Brent
Chief, Environmental Management Division

Enclosures

Copies Furnished:

Michael Barron
Patrick Chauvey
John Doresky
Melissa Kendrick
Bob Larimore
Pete Swiderek
November 17, 2000

David Pearce
Senior Biologist
URS Corporation
5900 Windward Parkway, Suite 400
Alpharetta, Ga 30005

Subject: Known or Potential Occurrences of Special Concern Plant and Animal Species on or near Proposed Project Site, Chattahoochee County, Georgia

Dear Mr. Pearce:

This is in response to your request of October 24, 2000. According to our records, within a three mile radius of the project site, there are occurrences of the following:

- Croomia pauciflora (Croomia) approx. 2.0 mi. NE of site
- Macrolemys temminckii (Alligator Snapping Turtle) approx. 3.0 mi. W of site
- Panax quinquefolius (American Ginseng) approx. 0.5 mi. N of site
- Panax quinquefolius (American Ginseng) approx. 2.0 mi. NE of site
- Rhus michauxii (Dwarf Sumac), an imprecise location, approx. 2.5 mi. NW of site

Enclosed are lists that should aid in assessing the potential for rare species occurrences within the area of concern.

Please keep in mind the limitations of our database. The data collected by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program comes from a variety of sources, including museum and herbarium records, literature, and reports from individuals and organizations, as well as field surveys by our staff biologists. In most cases the information is not the result of a recent on-site survey by our staff. Many areas of Georgia have never been surveyed thoroughly. Therefore, the Georgia Natural Heritage Program can only occasionally provide definitive information on the presence or absence of rare species on a given site. Our files are updated constantly as new information is received. Thus, information provided by our program represents the existing data in our files at the time of the request and should not be considered a final statement on the species or area under consideration.

If you know the location of populations of special concern species that are not in our database, please fill out the appropriate data collection form and send it to our office. Forms can be obtained through our web site (http://www.dnr.state.ga.us/dnr/wild/natural.html) or by contacting our office. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Greg Krakow
Data Manager

enclosures
GEORGIA NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM
EXPLANATION OF RARITY RANKS AND LEGAL STATUSES

The "State Rank" and "Global Rank" codes indicate relative rarity of species statewide and range-wide, respectively. An explanation of these codes follows.

STATE [GLOBAL] RANK
S1[G1] = Critically imperiled in state [globally] because of extreme rarity (5 or fewer occurrences).
S2[G2] = Imperiled in state [globally] because of rarity (6 to 20 occurrences).
S3[G3] = Rare or uncommon in state [rare and local throughout range or in a special habitat or narrowly endemic] (on the order of 21 to 100 occurrences).
S5[G5] = Demonstrably secure in state [globally].
SA = Accidental in state, including migratory or wide-ranging species recorded only once or twice or at very great intervals.
SN = Regularly occurring, usually migratory and typically nonbreeding species.
SR = Reported from the state, but without persuasive documentation (no precise site records and no verification of taxonomy).
SU[GU] = Possibly in peril in state [range-wide] but status uncertain; need more information on threats or distribution.
SX[GX] = Apparently extirpated from state [extinct throughout range]. GXC is known only in cultivation/captivity.
SE = An exotic established in state; may be native elsewhere in North America; sometimes difficult to determine if native (SE?).
SH[GH] = Of historical occurrence in the state [throughout its range], perhaps not verified in the past 20 years, but suspected to be still extant.
[T] = Taxonomic subdivision (trinomial, either a subspecies or variety), used in a global rank, for example "G2T2."
Q = Denotes a taxonomic question - either the taxon is not generally recognized as valid, or there is reasonable concern about its validity or identity globally or at the state level.
? = Denotes questionable rank; best guess given whenever possible (e.g. S3?).
FEDERAL STATUS (US-Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS)
The following abbreviations are used to indicate the legal status of federally-protected plants and animals or those proposed for listing.

LE = Listed endangered. The most critically imperiled species. A species that may become extinct or disappear from a significant part of its range if not immediately protected.

LT = Listed threatened. The next most critical level of threatened species. A species that may become endangered if not protected.

PE or PT = Candidate species currently proposed for listing as endangered or threatened.

C = Candidate species presently under status review for federal listing for which adequate information exists on biological vulnerability and threats to list the taxa as endangered or threatened.

*N = Status varies for different populations or parts of range with at least one part not listed (e.g., a species with part of its range assigned by USFWS as threatened, would be recorded as "LT*N").

STATE STATUS (Georgia Department of Natural Resources, GA-DNR)
The following abbreviations are used to indicate the status of state-protected plants and animals or those proposed for state-protection in Georgia.

E = Listed as endangered.

T = Listed as threatened.

R = Listed as rare.

U = Listed as unusual (and thus deserving of special consideration). For example plants subject to commercial exploitation would have this status.

NOTE:
This is a working list and is constantly revised. For the latest changes, acknowledgment of numerous sources, interpretation of data, or other information connected with this list, please contact:

Greg Krakow, Data Manager
Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Wildlife Resources Division
Georgia Natural Heritage Program
2117 U.S. Highway 278 S.E.
Social Circle, Georgia 30025-4714
Phone: 770-918-6411 or 706-557-3032
Fax: 706-557-3033
E-mail: greg_krakow@mail.dnr.state.ga.us

The proper citation for this list is:
Georgia Natural Heritage Program. [Edition date from top right corner]. [Title from top center]. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Social Circle.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus parviflora</td>
<td>BOTTLEBRUSH BUCKEYE</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic bluff and ravine forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrimonia incisa</td>
<td>CUTLEAF AGRIMONY; CUTLEAF HARVEST LICE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed oak-hickory forests, pine savannas, mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorpha scheringii</td>
<td>SCHWERIN INDIGO-BUSH</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky upland woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphanthus pusillus</td>
<td>POOL SPRITE, SNORKELWORT</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Vernal pools on granite outcrops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone berlandieri</td>
<td>GLADE WINDFLOWER</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite outcrop-scotones; openings over basic rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabis georgiana</td>
<td>GEORGIA ROCKCRESS</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky or sandy river bluffs and banks, in circumneutral soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias purpurascens</td>
<td>PURPLE MILKWEED</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland oak-hickory-pine forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster georgianus</td>
<td>GEORGIA ASTER</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinacea laevigata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisia megacarpa</td>
<td>BIGPOD WILD INDIGO</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berberis canadensis</td>
<td>AMERICAN BARBERRY</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cherty, thinly wooded slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickellia cordifolia</td>
<td>FLYR'S NEMESIS</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchnera americana</td>
<td>BLUEHEARTS</td>
<td>G5?</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet meadows; seasonally moist barrens and limestone glades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campylopus caroliniae</td>
<td>SANDHILL AWNED MOSS</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S2S?Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall line sandhills; Altamaha Grit outcrops in partial shade of mesic oak forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex collinsii</td>
<td>NARROW-FRUIT SWAMP SEDGE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seepage bogs; Atlantic whitecedar swamps; other habitats?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex longchomarca</td>
<td>SEDGE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearwater creek swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex praasina</td>
<td>DROOPYING SEDGE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forested seepage slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex stricta</td>
<td>SEDGE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sag ponds and other seasonal ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex torta</td>
<td>TWISTED SEDGE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky streambeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex venusta</td>
<td>SEDGE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs and low woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castanea dentata</td>
<td>AMERICAN CHESTNUT (NUT-BEARING ONLY)</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland mixed oak or oak-hickory forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecrista debeningiana</td>
<td>FLORIDA SENNA</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhill scrub; longleaf pine-wiregrass savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecyparis thyoides</td>
<td>ATLANTIC WHITE CEDAR</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleanwater stream swamps in fall line sandhills</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Chrysoma pauciflorulosa</td>
<td>WOODY GOLDENROD</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohooppe dunes; sandridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirsium virginianum</td>
<td>VIRGINIA THISTLE</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist pinelands; moist longleaf pine/wiregrass savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsonia tuberosa</td>
<td>STONEROOT</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic woods over basic rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corydalis flavula</td>
<td>YELLOW CORYDALIS</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky floodplain forests; hardwood ravines over amphibolite or limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus ravenelli</td>
<td>BIGFRUIT HAWTHORN</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>SUQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crotonia pauciflora</td>
<td>CROOMIA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyperus refractus</td>
<td>FLATSEDGE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy rocky woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmodium sasiliifolium</td>
<td>SESSILE-LEAF TICK-TREFOIL</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills in oak forest openings; perhaps prairie relict areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodecatheon meadia</td>
<td>SHOOTING-STAR</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis tenuis</td>
<td>SPIKERUSH</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fothergilla gardenii</td>
<td>DWARF WITCH-ALDER.</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Openings in low woods; swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnopogon brevifolius</td>
<td>BROAD-LEAVED BEARDGRASS</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcareous glades and prairies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthemum canadense</td>
<td>CANDADIAN FROSTWEED</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seepage bogs, sometimes with Sarracenia rubra near the Fall Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus smithii</td>
<td>SMITH SUNFLOWER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, sandy scrub in fire-suppressed longleaf pine forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexastylis shuttleworthii var. harperi</td>
<td>HARPER HEARTLEAF</td>
<td>G4T3</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry open woods and thickets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymenocallis coronaria</td>
<td>SHOALS SPIDERLILY</td>
<td>G2Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low terraces in floodplain forests; edges of bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipomopsis rubra</td>
<td>STANDING CYPRESS</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky shoals of broad, open rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris brevicaulis</td>
<td>LAMANCE IRIS</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite outcrops; sandridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoetes melanopoda</td>
<td>BLACK-FOOTED QUILWORT</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs, seeps, marshy shores and floodplains; often hidden in taller vegetation due to its low stature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listera australis</td>
<td>SOUTHERN TWAYBLADE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey soils in low woods; sandstone or granite outcrop seeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonicera flava</td>
<td>YELLOW HONEYSUCKLE</td>
<td>G5?</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly drained circumneutral soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbrideopsis caroliniana</td>
<td>CAROLINA BOGMINT</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky, upland forests and thickets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bogs; marshes; alluvial woods
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matelea abalamines</td>
<td>ALABAMA MILKVINE</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Open bluff forests; mesic margins of longleaf pine sandridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matelea flavidula</td>
<td>YELLOW MILKVINE</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open bluff forests; floodplain forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanthis latifolium</td>
<td>BROADLEAF BUNCHFLOWER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesc deciduous hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanthis woodii</td>
<td>OZARK BUNCHFLOWER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesc hardwood forests over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirabilis albida</td>
<td>PALE UMBRELLA-WORT</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills of SW Georgia with Warea sessilifora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myriophyllum laxum</td>
<td>LAX WATER-MILFOIL</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Bluehole spring runs; shallow, sandy, swift-flowing creeks; clear, cool ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neotricum umbellula</td>
<td>INDIAN OLIVE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Mixed with dwarf shrubby heaths in oak-hickory-pine woods; often in transition areas between flatwoods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenlandia boschii</td>
<td>BLUETS</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesc hardwood forests over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachysandra procumbens</td>
<td>ALLEGHENY-SPURGE</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesc hardwood forests; cove hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panax quinquefolius</td>
<td>AMERICAN GINSENG</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, open, calcareous soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paristaria pensylvanica</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA PELLITORY, HAMMERWORT</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longleaf pine-turkey oak scrub, mostly Apalachia River drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paronychia rugelii var, interior</td>
<td>RUGEL NAILWORT</td>
<td>G2?T2?Q</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills; dry pinelands and hammocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaseolus polystachios var, sinuatus</td>
<td>TRAILING BEAN-VINE</td>
<td>G4T3?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite outcrops; seasonally exposed muddy shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliularia americana</td>
<td>AMERICAN PILLWORT</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In shallow, sandy, clearwater streams and seeps; Atlantic whitecedar swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinciculca primuliflora</td>
<td>CLEARWATER BUTTERWORT</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sandhills near fall line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pityopsis pinifolia</td>
<td>SANDHILL GOLDEN-ASTER</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Wet savannas, pitcherplant bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platania integrata</td>
<td>YELLOW FRINGELESS ORCHID</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet savannas, pitcherplant bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platania nivea</td>
<td>SNOWY ORCHID</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcareous swamps; marly outcrops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porthvea racemosa</td>
<td>SHADOW-WITCH ORCHID</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy upper ravine slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus arkansas</td>
<td>ARKANSAS OAK</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff forests; floodplain hammocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus austrina</td>
<td>BLUFF WHITE OAK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite outcrops; quartzite and gneiss ridgetops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus georgiana</td>
<td>GEORGIA OAK</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus prinoides</td>
<td>DWARF CHINKAPIN OAK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; usually over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron flammeum</td>
<td>OCONEE AZALEA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff forests and mesic woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron prinophillum</td>
<td>PLUMLEAF AZALEA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests in ravines and on sandy, seepy streambanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus michauxii</td>
<td>DWARF SUMAC</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Open forests over ultramafic rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynchospora scirpoides</td>
<td>LONG-BEAK BALDRUSH</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floating mats in ponds; pond margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudbeckia heliosidis</td>
<td>LITTLE RIVER BLACK-EYED SUSAN</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone or sandstone barrens and streamslides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarracenia rubra</td>
<td>SWEET PITCHERPLANT</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic white cedar swamps; wet meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schisandra glabra</td>
<td>BAY STARVINE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Stream terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwalbea americana</td>
<td>CHAFFSEED</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ponds margins and wet savannas; upland ridge forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus atroculatus</td>
<td>CLUB-RUSH</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshes; shallow ponds; peaty swamps, as Okefenokee Swamp and Atlantic whitecedar swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedum nevii</td>
<td>NEVius STONECROP</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gneiss ledges on river bluffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedum pusillum</td>
<td>DWARF GRANITE STONECROP</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite outcrops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silene ovala</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN CATCHFLY</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic deciduous forests over limestone; high elevation oak forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silene polypetala</td>
<td>FRINGED CAMPION</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mesic deciduous forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smilax leptanthera</td>
<td>CATBRIER</td>
<td>GHQ</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solanum carolinense var. hirsutum</td>
<td>HORSE-NETTLE</td>
<td>G5T1</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thickets; calcareous barrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiranthus ovalis</td>
<td>OVAL LADIES-TRESSES</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist hammocks; swamp margins; wet thickets over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewartia melacodendron</td>
<td>SILKY CAMELLIA</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steepheads, bayheads; edges of swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylosma pickeringii var. pickeringii</td>
<td>PICKERING MORNING-GLORY</td>
<td>G4T2T3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open, dry, oak scrub of sandhills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragia cordata</td>
<td>HEARTLEAF NETTLE VINE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, usually rocky, calcareous woods; also relict prairie openings on the Fort Valley Plateau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepocarpus aechusae</td>
<td>TREPOCARPUS</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triadenum tubulosum</td>
<td>BROADLEAF MARSH ST. JOHNSWORT</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S1S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridens carolinianus</td>
<td>CAROLINA REDTOP</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry pine forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium decipiens</td>
<td>MIMIC TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests; limesink forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium lancifolium</td>
<td>LANCELEAF TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests; also lower rocky slopes over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium relikum</td>
<td>RELICT TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests; limesink forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvularia floridana</td>
<td>FLORIDA BELLWORT</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed oak-hickory forests; mesic hardwoods or magnolia-beech bluff forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warea sessilifolia</td>
<td>SANDHILL-CRESS</td>
<td>G2G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xyris chapmanii</td>
<td>CHAPMAN YELLOW-EYED GRASS</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Streamhead seepage bogs in deep muck with numerous other xyrids and graminoids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xyris scabrida</td>
<td>HARPER YELLOW-EYED GRASS</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sedge bogs; pitcherplant bogs; pine flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zigadenus lemanthoides</td>
<td>DEATH-CAMUS</td>
<td>G4Q</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhill bogs; pine flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almiphi aestivalis BACHMAN'S SPARROW</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open pine or oak woods; old fields; brushy areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alosa chrysoscloris SKIFJACK HERRING</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwater of medium-sized streams to large rivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameiurus nervosus SPOTTED BULLHEAD</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large streams and rivers with moderate current and rock-sand substrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammodramus heslouis HESLLOW'S SPARROW</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet shrubby fields and weedy meadows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botaurus lentiginosus AMERICAN BITTERN</td>
<td>G4, S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshes; lakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprinella calliantha BLUESTRIPE SHINER</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas in large creeks and medium-sized rivers over rocky substrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimia albaniensis BLACK-CREST ELIMIA</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slackwater habitats in medium-sized rivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimia boykiniana FLAXEN ELIMIA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel or cobble shoals with moderate current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptio nigella WINGED SPIKE</td>
<td>GH</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring influenced streams with substrate of sand and limestone rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptioidea sloatianus PURPLE BANKCLIMBER</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Small to large rivers with moderate current and substrate of sand, fine gravel, or muddy sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma edwini BROWN DARTER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small to moderate sized flowing streams in root masses or aquatic vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma parvipinne GOLDSTRIPE DARTER</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small sluggish streams and spring seepage areas in woody debris, leaf material, mud, and silt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma swaini GULF DARTER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small to medium streams with moderate current over substrates of sand and detritus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumeces anthracinus COAL SKINK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(PS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist woods near streams, springs or bogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumeces egregius MOLE SKINK</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>(PS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal dunes; longleaf pine-turkey oak woods; dry hammocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopherus polyphemus GOPHER TORTOISE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>(PS;LT)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sandhills; dry hammocks; longleaf pine-turkey oak woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graptemys barbouri BARBOUR'S MAP TURTLE</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Rivers &amp; creeks Apalachicola River drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halaeetus leucocephalus BALD EAGLE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(PS;LT)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Edges of lakes &amp; large rivers; seacoasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterodon simus SOUTHERN HOGNOSE SNAKE</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open, sandy woods; fields; floodplains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichthyomys gogae SOUTHERN BROOK LAMPREY</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creeks to small rivers with sand or sand and gravel substrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampropterus triangulum triangulum EASTERN MILK SNAKE</td>
<td>G5T5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woods; fields; forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsilis binominata</td>
<td>GH</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large creeks and rivers in stabilized shoals in moderate to swift current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsilis subangulata</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sandy/rocky medium-sized rivers &amp; creeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandblasted pocketbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woods; field edges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanius ludovicianus migrans</td>
<td>G5T3Q</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pools and backwater areas in small to medium-sized creeks over sandy substrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant loggerhead shrike</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivers; lakes; large ponds near streams; swamps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropterus cataractae</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy/rocky medium-sized rivers &amp; creeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoal bass</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Shoals and riffles of large streams to rivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis australis</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caves &amp; buildings near water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern myotis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Habitat data is not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necturus sp. cf. beyeri</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Springs and spring influenced creeks over sand or rocky substrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf coast waterdog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas of small to large streams over sand or bedrock substrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notropis harperi</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>River swamps; marshes; cypress/gum ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeye chub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River swamps; marshes; cypress/gum ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notropis hypsilus</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Open woods; savannas; old fields; edges of streams &amp; ponds; sandhills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highscale shiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open pine woods; pine savannas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyctanassa violacea</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland forests; grasslands; floodplains; old field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-crowned night-heron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist forests near rocky streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nycticorax nycticorax</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, medium-sized rivers &amp; creeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-crowned night-heron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas of medium sized streams associated with sandy substrate and woody debris or vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophisaurus attenuatus</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas of small clear streams over sand substrate; often associated with woody debris or vege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slender glass lizard</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picoides borealis</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-capped woodpecker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus</td>
<td>G4T3?</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida pine snake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plethodon websteri</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster's salamander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleurodeira pyrrhops</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval pigtoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteronotrops euryzonus</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstripe shiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteronotrops hypselopterus</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailfin shiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincuncia infucata</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptured pigtoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scartomyzon lachneri</td>
<td>GREATER JUMPROCK</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small to large streams in swift current over rocky substrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strophitus subvexus</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CREEKMUSSEL</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand to sandy mud in slow or no current in small to large creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimophila aestivalis</td>
<td>BACHMAN'S SPARROW</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open pine or oak woods; old fields; brushy areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alosa chrysocloris</td>
<td>SKIPJACK HERRING</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwater of medium-sized streams to large rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelurus serracanthus</td>
<td>SPOTTED BULLHEAD</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large streams and rivers with moderate current and rock-sand substrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammodramus henslowii</td>
<td>HENSLOWS SPARROW</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet shrubby fields and weedy meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botaurus lentiginosus</td>
<td>AMERICAN BITTERN</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshes; lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprinella callitaena</td>
<td>BLUESTRIPE SHINER</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas in large creeks and medium-sized rivers over rocky substrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptio nigella</td>
<td>WINGED SPIKE</td>
<td>GH</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring influenced streams with substrate of sand and limestone rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptioideus sloatianus</td>
<td>PURPLE BANKCLIMBER</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Small to large rivers with moderate current and substrate of sand, fine gravel, or muddy sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma adwini</td>
<td>BROWN DARTER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small to moderate sized flowing streams in root masses or aquatic vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma parvipinne</td>
<td>GOLDstripe DARTER</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small sluggish streams and spring seepage areas in woody debris, leaf material, mud, and silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma swaini</td>
<td>GULF DARTER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small to medium streams with moderate current over substrates of sand and detritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumeces anthracinus</td>
<td>COAL SKINK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist woods near streams, springs or bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumeces egregius</td>
<td>MOLE SKINK</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>(PS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal dunes; longleaf pine-turkey oak woods; dry hammocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopherus polyphemus</td>
<td>GOPHER TURTOISE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>(PS:LT)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sandhills; dry hammocks; longleaf pine-turkey oak woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graptemys barbouri</td>
<td>BARBOUR'S MAP TURTLE</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivers &amp; creeks Apalachicola River drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</td>
<td>BALD EAGLE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(PS:LT)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Edges of lakes &amp; large rivers; seacoasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterodon simulus</td>
<td>SOUTHERN HOGNOSE SNAKE</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open, sandy woods; fields; floodplains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichthyomyzon gagei</td>
<td>SOUTHERN BROOK LAMPREY</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creeks to small rivers with sand or sand and gravel substrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampropelitta triangulum</td>
<td>EASTERN MILK SNAKE</td>
<td>G5T5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woods; fields; forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsilis binominata</td>
<td>LINED POCKETBOOK</td>
<td>GH</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large creeks and rivers in stabilized shoals in moderate to swift current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsilis subangulata</td>
<td>SHINYRAYED POCKETBOOK</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sandy/rocky medium-sized rivers &amp; creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanigus ludovicianus migrans</td>
<td>MIGRANT LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE</td>
<td>G5T3Q</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woods; field edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lythurus atriplicus</td>
<td>BLACKTIP SHINER</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pools and backwater areas in small to medium-sized creeks over sandy substrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrolemys temminckii</td>
<td>ALLIGATOR SNAPING TURTLE</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivers; lakes; large ponds near streams; swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediones penicillatus</td>
<td>GULF MOCCASIN SHELL</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sandy/rocky medium-sized rivers &amp; creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropterus cataractae</td>
<td>SHOAL BASS</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoals and riffles of large streams to rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis auroriparius</td>
<td>SOUTHEASTERN MYOTIS</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caves &amp; buildings near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nectarus sp. cf. beyeri</td>
<td>GULF COAST WATERDOG</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Habitat data is not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notropis harperi</td>
<td>REDEYE CHUB</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springs and spring influenced creeks over sand or rocky substrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notropis hypsilolpis</td>
<td>HIGHSCALE SHINER</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas of small to large streams over sand or bedrock substrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystanassa violacea</td>
<td>YELLOW-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River swamps; marshes; cypress/gum ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nycticorax nycticorax</td>
<td>BLACK-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River swamps; marshes; cypress/gum ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophisaurus attenuatus</td>
<td>SLENDER GLASS LIZARD</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woods; savannas; old fields; edges of streams &amp; ponds; sandhills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picoides borealis</td>
<td>RED-COCKADED WOODPECKER</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Open pine woods; pine savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus</td>
<td>FLORIDA PINE SNAKE</td>
<td>G4T3?</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland forests; grasslands; floodplains; old field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleurobema pyriforme</td>
<td>OVAL PIGTOE</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sandy, medium-sized rivers &amp; creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteronotropsis euryzonus</td>
<td>BROADSTRIPED SHINER</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Flowing areas of medium sized streams associated with sandy substrate and woody debris or vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteronotropsis hypselopterus</td>
<td>SAILFIN SHINER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flowing areas of small clear streams over sand substrate; often associated with woody debris or vegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana capito</td>
<td>GOPHER FROG</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>(PS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplains; wet meadows; pastures; ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaphromayzon lachneri</td>
<td>GREATER JUMPROCK</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small to large streams in swift current over rocky substrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strophius subvexus</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CREEK MUSSEL</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand to sandy mud in slow or no current in small to large creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterbackia peggyae</td>
<td>FLORIDA FLOATER</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sluggish streams or ponds in sandy to muddy substrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villosa villosa</td>
<td>DOWNY RAINBOW</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand, muddy, and silty substrates from spring-fed streams to muddy slow moving waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus parviflora</td>
<td>BOTTLEBRUSH BUCKEYE</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic bluff and ravine forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrimonia incisa</td>
<td>CUTLEAF AGRIMONY; CUTLEAF HARVEST LICE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed oak-hickory forests, pine savannas, mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone berlandieri</td>
<td>GLADE WINDFLOWER</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite outcrop ecotones; openings over basic rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone caroliniana</td>
<td>CAROLINA WINDFLOWER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland seepage swamp openings over fredisol soils; wet meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabis georgiana</td>
<td>GEORGIA ROCKCRESS</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky or sandy river bluffs and banks, in circumneutral soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnoglossum sulcatum</td>
<td>GROOVED-STEM INDIAN-PLANTAIN</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottomland forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias pedicellata</td>
<td>SAVANNA MILKWEED</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longleaf pine flatwoods; sandy pinelands with longleaf pine-saw palmetto-myrtle oak (Sapelo Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias rubra</td>
<td>RED MILKWEED</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs, wet savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster georgianus</td>
<td>GEORGIAASTER</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinaceae laevigata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisia megacarpa</td>
<td>BIGPOD WILD INDIGO</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickellia cordifolia</td>
<td>FLYR'S NEMESIS</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchnera americana</td>
<td>BLUEHEARTS</td>
<td>G5?</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet meadows; seasonally moist barrens and limestone glades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campylopus carolinus</td>
<td>SANDHILL AWNED MOSS</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S2?Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall line sandhills; Altamaha Grit outcrops in partial shade of mesic oak forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex collinsii</td>
<td>NARROW-FRUIT SWAMP SEDGE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seepage bogs; Atlantic whitecedar swamps; other habitats?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex dasyarpa</td>
<td>VELVET SEDGE</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen hammocks; mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex lonchocarpa</td>
<td>SEDGE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearwater creek swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex stricta</td>
<td>SEDGE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sag ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castanea dentata</td>
<td>AMERICAN CHESTNUT (NUT-BEARING ONLY)</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland mixed oak or oak-hickory forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecrista darjeelingiana</td>
<td>FLORIDA SENNA</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhill scrub; longleaf pine-wiregrass savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysoma pacificosculosa</td>
<td>WOODY GOLDENROD</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohoopee dunes; sandridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirsium virginianum</td>
<td>VIRGINIA THISTLE</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist pinelands; moist longleaf pine/wiregrass savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsonia tuberosa</td>
<td>STONEROOT</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic woods over basic rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corydalis flavula YELLOw CORYDALIS</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky floodplain forests; hardwood ravines over amphibolite or limestone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croomia pauciflora CROOMIA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmodium sessilifolium SESSILE-LEAF TICK-TREFOIL</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills in oak forest openings; perhaps prairie relict areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodecatheon meadia SHOOTING-STAR</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis atrupurpurea SPIKERUSH</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limesink pond margins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis melanocarpa BLACKFRUIT SPIKERUSH</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limesink pond margins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis montana var. nudulosa SPIKERUSH</td>
<td>G5T?</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limesink ponds and sloughs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis robbinsii SPIKERUSH</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pine savanna ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyonurus triassocoides PAN-AMERICAN BALSAMSACLE</td>
<td>G5?</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pine savannas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fimbristylis decipiens SOUTHERN FIMBRY</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet pine savannas; sandy seeps on Altamaha grit outcrops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fothergilla gardenii DWARF WITCH-ALDER</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openings in low woods; swamps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnopogon brevifolius BROAD-LEAVED BEARDGRASS</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prairies with Silphium pinnatifidum; known only from Murray Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthemum canadense CANDADIAN FROSTWEED</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seepage bogs, sometimes with Sarracenia rubra near the Fall Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus agrestis SOUTHEASTERN SUNFLOWER</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, sandy scrub in fire-suppressed longleaf pine forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus heterophyllus WETLAND SUNFLOWER</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mucky, wet soils in open flatwoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus smithii SMITH SUNFLOWER</td>
<td>G2Q</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs; wet pine savannas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexastylis shuttleworthii var. harperi HARPER HEARTLEAF</td>
<td>G4T3</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry open woods and thickets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygrophiila lacustris HYGROPHILA</td>
<td>G5?</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low terraces in floodplain forests; edges of bogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymenocallis coronaria SHOALS SPIDERLILY</td>
<td>G2Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shallow water of marshy shores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypericum androsaemum BOG ST. JOHNSWORT</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky shoals of broad, open rivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex armelanchier SERVICEBERRY HOLLY</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swamps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris brevicaulis LAMANCE IRIS</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet, sandy thickets; cypress-gum swamps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs, seeps, marshy shores and floodplains; often hidden in taller vegetation due to its low stature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoetes melanopoda</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayey soils in low woods; sandstone or granite outcrop seeps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krameria lanceolata</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longleaf pine-wiregrass sandridges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liatris chapmanii</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linum sulcatum var. harperi</td>
<td>G5TU</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry pinelands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listera australis</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly drained circumneutral soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbridea caroliniana</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs; marshes; alluvial woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia pyramidata</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Bluff and ravine forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matelea alabamensis</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open bluff forests; mesic margins of longleaf pine sandridges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matelea flexidula</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open bluff forests; floodplain forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanthium latifolium</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic deciduous hardwood forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanthium woodii</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirabilis albida</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills of SW Georgia with Warea sessiliflora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhlenbergia torreyana</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seasonally inundated pond shores, swales and savannas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrica incoda</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayheads, tili swamps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myriophyllum laxum</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluehole spring runs; shallow, sandy, swift-flowing creeks; clear, cool ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najas filicola</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestoria umbellula</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed with dwarf shrubby heaths in oak-hickory-pine woods; often in transition areas between flatwoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenlandia boscii</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cypress pond margins; exposed pond bottoms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachysandra procumbens</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panax quinquefolius</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests; cove hardwood forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parietaria pensylvanica</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, open, calcareous soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paronychia rugellii var. interior</td>
<td>G2TT2?Q</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longleaf pine-turkey oak scrub, mostly Alapaha River drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentodon pentlandrus</td>
<td>G5?</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet meadows; pond edges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaseolus polystachios var. sinuat us</td>
<td>TRAILING BEAN-VINE</td>
<td>G4T3?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills; dry pinelands and hammocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinguicula primuliflora</td>
<td>CLEARWATER BUTTERWORT</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>In shallow, sandy, clearwater streams and seeps; Atlantic whitecedar swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pityopsis pinifolia</td>
<td>SANDHILL GOLDEN-ASTER</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills near fall line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanthera integra</td>
<td>YELLOW FRINGELESS ORCHID</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet savannas, pitcherplant bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanthera nivea</td>
<td>SNOWY ORCHID</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet savannas, pitcherplant bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygala baldwinii</td>
<td>WHITE MILKWORT</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet pine savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygala boykinii</td>
<td>BOYKIN MILKWORT</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openings in calcareous soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontheva racemosa</td>
<td>SHADOW-WITCH ORCHID</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcareous swamps; marly outcrops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus arkansana</td>
<td>ARKANSAS OAK</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy upper ravine slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus austrina</td>
<td>BLUFF WHITE OAK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff forests; floodplain hammocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus breviloba</td>
<td>SHALLOW-LOBED OAK</td>
<td>G5T5</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus prinoides</td>
<td>DWARF CHINKAPIN OAK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; usually over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus sinuata</td>
<td>BASTARD OAK, DURAND OAK</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron austrinum</td>
<td>FLORIDA AZALEA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardwood-spruce pine forests; low woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron flammeum</td>
<td>OCONEE AZALEA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff forests and mesic woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron prunifolium</td>
<td>PLUMLEAF AZALEA</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests in ravines and on sandy, seepy streambanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus mitchaudi</td>
<td>DWARF SUMAC</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Open forests over ultramafic rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora culixa</td>
<td>GEORGIA BEAKEDGE</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pine savannas; flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora decurrens</td>
<td>SWAMP-FOREST BEAKEDGE</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora harperi</td>
<td>HARPER'S BEAKEDGE</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S1S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cypress pond margins and wet savannas; limesink depression ponds (dolines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora macro</td>
<td>SOUTHERN WHITE BEAKEDGE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peaty, sandhill seepage slopes; streamhead pocosins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora oligantha</td>
<td>FEATHER-BRISTLE BEAKEDGE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs; sea-level fens; wet savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora pleiurtha</td>
<td>COASTAL BEAKEDGE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margins of limesink depression ponds (dolines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora punctata</td>
<td>PINELAND BEAKSEDGE</td>
<td>G1?</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet savannas, pitcherplant bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora scirpoides</td>
<td>LONG-BEAK BALDRUSH</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floating mats in ponds; pond margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora stenophylla</td>
<td>LITTLELEAF BEAKRUSH</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet, sandy, peaty depressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora torreyana</td>
<td>TORREY BEAKRUSH</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs; wet savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudbeckia heliosidis</td>
<td>LITTLE RIVER BLACK-EYED SUSAN</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone or sandstone barrens and streamside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudbeckia nitida var. nitida</td>
<td>YELLOW CONEFLOWER</td>
<td>G3T2T3</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet savannas, pitcherplant bogs; cypress ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarracenia rubra</td>
<td>SWEET PITCHERPLANT</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic white cedar swamps; wet meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schisandra glabra</td>
<td>BAY STARVINE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stream terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizachyrium stoloniferum</td>
<td>BLUESTEM</td>
<td>G3G4Q</td>
<td>S2S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longleaf pine-wiregrass savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwelbea americana</td>
<td>CHAFFSEED</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ponds margins and wet savannas; upland ridge forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus erisianse</td>
<td>BULRUSH</td>
<td>G?</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pond shores in peaty sands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus obtusifolius</td>
<td>CLUB-RUSH</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S1S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshes; shallow ponds; peaty swamps, as Okefenokee Swamp and Atlantic white cedar swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus hallii</td>
<td>HALL BULRUSH</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pond shores in peaty sands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silene ovata</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN CATCHFLY</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic deciduous forests over limestone; high elevation oak forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smilax lasioneuron</td>
<td>CARRION-FLOWER</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pine-oak-hickory forests; bluff forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solanum carolinense var. hirsutum</td>
<td>HORSE-NETTLE</td>
<td>G5T1</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thickets; calcareous barrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago taida</td>
<td>GOLDENROD</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy upland forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiranthus ovalis</td>
<td>OVAL LADIES-TRESSES</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist hammocks; swamp margins; wet thickets over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewartia malacodendron</td>
<td>SILKY CAMELLIA</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleepheads, bayheads; edges of swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylosma pickeringii var. pickeringii</td>
<td>PICKERING MORNING-GLORY</td>
<td>G4T2T3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open, dry, oak scrub of sandhills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tephrosia mohrii</td>
<td>DWARF GOATS RUE</td>
<td>G2Q</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub; longleaf pine-wiregrass savannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelypteris ovata</td>
<td>OVATE MAIDEN FERN</td>
<td>G3G5</td>
<td>S2S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcareous hammocks; limesinks; mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragia cordata</td>
<td>HEARTLEAF NETTLE VINE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, usually rocky, calcareous woods; also relict prairie openings on the Fort Valley Plateau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepocarpus aethusae</td>
<td>TREPOCARPUS</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triadenum tubulsum</td>
<td>BROADLEAF MARSH ST. JOHNSWORT</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S1S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridens carolinianus</td>
<td>CAROLINA REDTOP</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry pine forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium decipiens</td>
<td>MIMIC TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests; limesink forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium lancefolium</td>
<td>LANCELEAF TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests; also lower rocky slopes over basic soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium relicitum</td>
<td>RELICT TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests; limesink forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium underwoodii</td>
<td>DWARF MIMIC TRILLIUM</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesic hardwood forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utricularia olivacea</td>
<td>LEAFLESS DWARF BLADDERWORT</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shallow ponds, especially limesink ponds or dolines of Southwest Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvularia floridana</td>
<td>FLORIDA BELLWORT</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S3?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed oak-hickory forests; mesic hardwoods or magnolia-beech bluff forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitis palmata</td>
<td>CATBIRD GRAPE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests; river banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitis rotundifolia var. munsoniana</td>
<td>MUNSON GRAPE</td>
<td>G5T4?</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain forests; blackwater stream sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warea sessilifolia</td>
<td>SANDHILL-CRESS</td>
<td>G2G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhills scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xyris chapmanii</td>
<td>CHAPMAN YELLOW-EYED GRASS</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Streamhead seepage bogs in deep muck with numerous other xyrids and graminoids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xyris scabirifolia</td>
<td>HARPER YELLOW-EYED GRASS</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sedge bogs; pitcher plant bogs; pine flatwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephyranthes simpsonii</td>
<td>SIMPSON RAIN LILY</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pine flatwoods; edges of sloughs on southcentral coastal plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zigadenus leimanthoides</td>
<td>DEATH-CAMUS</td>
<td>G4Q</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhill bogs; pine flatwoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Index of Quarter Quads
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"US" indicates both U.S. protected and Georgia protected species
"GA" indicates Georgia protected species

List generated on: Wednesday May 31, 2000

Faceville (NE)

- *Chamaecrista deeringiana* Florida Senna
- *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* Bald Eagle
- *Melanthium woodii* Ozark Bunchflower
- *Villosa villosa* Downy Rainbow

Faceville (NW)

- *Aster praealtus* Willow-leaf Aster
- *Drymarchon couperi* Eastern Indigo Snake
- *Elliottio arctata* Delicate Spike
- *Graptemys barbouri* Barbour's Map Turtle
- *Picoides borealis* Red-cockaded Woodpecker
- *Pteroglossaspis ecrisitana* Wild Coco

Faceville (SE)

- *Ambela neisleri* Fat Threeridge
- *Carex dasycarpa* Velvet Sedge
- *Carex decomposita* Cypress-knee Sedge
- *Chamaecrista deeringiana* Florida Senna
- *Elliottio arctata* Delicate Spike
- *Epidendrum conopseum* Green-fly Orchid
- *Melanthium woodii* Ozark Bunchflower
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GA* Notophthalmus perstriatus Striped Newt
  • Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus Florida Pine Snake
  • Tephrosia chrysophylla Sprawling Goats Rue

Fort Benning (NE)

GA* Macrolemys temminckii Alligator Snapping Turtle
US* Rhus michauxii Dwarf Sumac

Fort Benning (NW)

GA* Macrolemys temminckii Alligator Snapping Turtle
US* Rhus michauxii Dwarf Sumac

Fort Benning (SE)

GA* Graptemys barbouri Barbour's Map Turtle
  • Gymnopogon brevifolius Broad-leaved Beardgrass
  • Iris brevicaulis Lamance Iris
  • Lampropeltis triangulum triangulum Eastern Milk Snake
GA* Macrolemys temminckii Alligator Snapping Turtle
  • Phaseolus polystachios var. sinuatus Trailing Bean-vine
  • Tragia cordata Heartleaf Nettle Vine
  • Trepocarpus aethusae Trepocarpus

Fort Benning (SW)

GA* Arabis georgiana Georgia Rockcress
  • Iris brevicaulis Lamance Iris
GA* Macrolemys temminckii Alligator Snapping Turtle
  • Trepocarpus aethusae Trepocarpus

Fort Gaines NE (SE)

US* Gopherus polyphemus Gopher Tortoise
  • Melanthium woodii Ozark Bunchflower

Fort Gaines NE (SW)
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GA • *Cuscuta harperi* Harper Dodder
GA • *Cyprinella callictenia* Bluestripe Shiner
US • *Isoetes melanospora* Black-spored Quillwort
GA • *Notropis hypsilepis* Highscale Shiner

Frolona (SW)

GA • *Notropis hypsilepis* Highscale Shiner

---

Index of Quarter Quads
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Georgia Natural Heritage Program
Nongame Wildlife & Natural Heritage Section
2117 US Hwy 278 SE
Social Circle, GA 30025
(770) 918-6411

Georgia Natural Heritage Home Page

Notes:

- The absence of a quarter quad in this list indicates no rare element occurrences for that quarter quad in Georgia Natural Heritage Program's databases.
- Please send questions concerning this data to: greg_krakow@mail.dnr.state.ga.us

---

DISCLAIMER FOR QUARTER QUAD ELEMENT OCCURRENCE DATABASE

Please keep in mind the limitations of our database. The data collected by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program comes from a variety of sources, including museum and herbarium records, literature, and reports from individuals and organizations, as well as field surveys by our staff biologists. In most cases the information is not the result of a recent on-site survey by our staff. Many areas of Georgia have never been surveyed thoroughly. Therefore, the Georgia Natural Heritage Program can only occasionally provide definitive information on the presence or absence of rare species in a given area. Our files are updated constantly as new information is received. Thus, information provided by our program represents the existing data in our files on the date indicated on this Web page and should not be considered a final statement on the species or area under consideration.
LISTED SPECIES IN CHATTahooCHEE COUNTY

FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES

Animals

Bald eagle (T, SE)  Haliaeetus leucocephalus  Inland waterways and estuarine areas throughout Georgia. Active eagle nests were located in Chattahoochee County 1994-1999.

Wood stork (E, SE)  Mycteria americana  Primarily feed in fresh and brackish wetlands and nest in cypress or other wooded swamps.

Red-cockaded woodpecker (E, SE)  Picoides borealis  Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10' dbh.

Purple bankclimber mussel (T, ST)  Elliptioideus sloanianus  Main channels of ACF basin rivers in moderate currents over sand, sand mixed with mud, or gravel substrates.

Shiny-rayed pocketbook mussel (E, SE)  Lampsis pipungula  Medium creeks to the mainstems of rivers with slow to moderate currents over sandy substrates and associated with rock or clay.

Gulf moccasinshell mussel (E, SE)  Medionidus penicillatus  Medium streams to large rivers with slight to moderate current over sand and gravel substrates; may be associated with muddy sand substrates around tree roots.

Oval pigtue mussel (E, SE)  Pleurobema pyriforme  River tributaries and main channels in slow to moderate currents over silty sand, muddy sand, sand, and gravel substrates.

SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN 1: The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Middle Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species’ distributions in Georgia.

Animals

Appalachian Bewick’s wren (SR)  Thryomanes bewickii albus  Dense undergrowth, overgrown fields, thickets, and brush in open or semi-open habitat; feed primarily on insects.

Gopher tortoise (ST)  Gopherus polyphemus  Well drained, sandy soils in forest and grassy areas; associated with pine overstory, open understory with grass and forb groundcover, and sunny areas for nesting.

Florida pine snake  Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus  Arid pinelands, sandy areas, and dry mountain ridges.

Alligator snapping turtle (ST)  Macroclemys temmincki  Rivers, lakes, and large ponds near stream swamps.

Carolina gopher frog  Rana areolata capito  Brownwater streams.

Bluestripe shinier (ST)  Cyprinella callinena  Gravelly streams.

Broadstripe shinier (SR)  Pteronotropis caryzonus

Plants

Pickering’s morning-glory (ST)  Stylosis pickeringii var. pickeringii  Coarse white sands on sandhills near the Fall Line and on a few ancient dunes along the Flint and Ohoopoe Rivers.

STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES 1: The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30027 (706-557-3032).

Plants

Croonia (ST)  Croonia pauciflora  Rich moist deciduous woodlands, ravines, and river bluffs, often with ginseng.

Plumleaf azalea (ST)  Rhododendron prunifolium  Moist soils of rich hardwood ravines.

Bay star-vine (ST)  Schisandra glabra  Twining on subcanopy and understory trees/shrubs in rich alluvial woods.

1 Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.
Pickering's morning-glory (ST)  

*Stylistra pickeringii*  
var. *pickeringii*  

Chattahoochee River  
Coarse white sands on sandhills near the Fall Line and on a few ancient dunes along the Flint and Ohooper Rivers

**STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES**¹: The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30279 (706-557-3032).

**Plants**

- **Croomia (ST)**  
  *Croomia pauciflora*  
  Rich moist deciduous woodlands, ravines, and river bluffs, often with ginseng

- **Indian olive (ST)**  
  *Nestronia umbellula*  
  Dry open upland forests of mixed hardwood and pine

- **Sweet pitcher-plant (SE)**  
  *Sarracenia rubra*  
  Acid soils of open bogs, sandhill seeps, Atlantic white-cedar swamps, wet savannahs, low areas in pine flatwoods, and along sloughs and ditches

- **Granite rock stonecrop (ST)**  
  *Sedum pusillum*  
  Granite outcrops among mosses in partial shade under red cedar trees

¹ Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.

Updated February 2000
LISTED SPECIES IN MUSCOGEE COUNTY

FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES

Animals

Bald eagle (T,SE)  
Wood stork (E,SE)  
Red-cockaded woodpecker (E,SE)  
Purple bankclimber mussel (T,ST)  
Shiny-rayed pocketbook mussel (E,SE)  
Gulf moccasinshell mussel (E,SE)  
Oval pigtoe mussel (E,SE)  

Halaeetus leucocephalus  
Mystery americana  
Picoides borealis  
Elliptoideus sloatianus  
Lampsilis subangulata  
Medionidus penicillatus  
Pleurobema pyriforme

Inland waterways and estuarine areas in Georgia  
Primarily feed in fresh and brackish wetlands and nest in cypress or other wooded swamps  
Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10" dbh  
Main channels of ACF basin rivers in moderate currents over sand, sand mixed with mud, or gravel substrates  
Medium creeks to the mainstems of rivers with slow to moderate currents over sandy substrates and associated with rock or clay  
Medium streams to large rivers with slight to moderate current over sand and gravel substrates; may be associated with muddy sand substrates around tree roots  
River tributaries and main channels in slow to moderate currents over silty sand, muddy sand, sand, and gravel substrates

Plants

Michaux's sumac (E,SE)  
Relict trillium (E,SE)  

Rhus michauxii  
Trillium reliquum

Sandy or rocky open woods, usually on ridges with a disturbance history (periodic fire, prior agricultural use, maintained right-of-ways); the known population of this species in Muscogee County has been extirpated  
Hardwood forests; in the Piedmont, found in either in rich ravines or adjacent alluvial terraces with other spring-flowering herbs

SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN: The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species' distributions in Georgia.

Animals

Bachman’s sparrow (SR)  
Appalachian Bewick’s wren (SR)  
Bluestripe shiner (ST)  
Gopher tortoise (ST)  
Northern pine snake  
Alligator snapping turtle (ST)  
Winged spike mussel  
Lined pocketbook mussel  

Aimophila aestivalis  
Thyromanes bewickii altus  
Cyprinella callitaeana  
Gopherus polyphemus  
Pituophis m. melanoleucus  
Macrolemys tumminickii  
Elliptio nigella  
Lampsilis binominata

Abandoned fields with scattered shrubs, pines, or oaks  
Dense undergrowth, overgrown fields, thickets, and brush in open or semi-open habitat; feed primarily on insects  
Well drained, sandy soils in forest and grassy areas; associated with pine overstory, open understory with grass and forb groundcover, and sunny areas for nesting  
Rivers, lakes, and large ponds near stream swamps  
Main channels of Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers among rocks and muddy sand  
Main channels of Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers in stabilized sand and shoals with good current

Plants

Georgia rock-cress (ST)  
Shoals spider-lily (SE)  
Nevius’ stonecrop (ST)  

Arabis georgiana  
Hymenocallis coronaria  
Sedum nevii

Rocky (limestone, shale, granite-gneiss) bluffs and slopes along watercourses; also along sandy, eroding riverbanks  
Major streams and rivers in rocky shoals and in cracks of exposed bedrock; plants can be completely submerged during flooding  
Shallow soil over granitic gneiss on steep bluffs along the
Historic Preservation Division
W. Ray Luce, Division Director and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
156 Trinity Avenue, S.W., Suite 101, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3800
Telephone (404) 655-2840 Fax (404) 651-1040 http://www.gahpo.org

January 5, 2001

Sally Kistler, Cultural Resource Specialist
URS Corporation
5900 Windward Parkway, Suite 400
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005

RE: Fort Benning: Construct New/Expand Existing Post Exchange Facility
Muscogee County, Georgia
HP001120-001

Dear Ms. Kistler:

The Historic Preservation Division has reviewed the information submitted concerning
the proposed project to construct a new Post Exchange facility or expand the existing facility at
Fort Benning, Muscogee County, Georgia. Our comments are offered to assist the Department
of the Army and the Air Force Exchange Services in complying with the provisions of Section
106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Based on the information provided by URS Corporation, HPD concurs with the
determination that no historic structural or archaeological resources eligible for or listed in the
National Register of Historic Places will be affected by this undertaking.

If we may be of further assistance, please contact Serena G. Bellew, Environmental
Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Cloues
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

RC:kec

cc: Allison Slocum, Lower Chattahoochee RDC
Melissa,

Please note a couple of corrections I suggest to this notice.

ATTEN Mgr Glen Scherber says he wants a retail bank inside the new store, and has asked CBS if we would do this. You should add to the description "retail banking services."

Also, the W.C. Bradley Memorial Library closed last year. You should list the new library as the replacement location for viewing tax documents. It's located where Columbia Mall used to be, on Mason Road.

Cheers!

John Mitchell
GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM
EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

TO: Melissa Kendrick
    U.S. Army Infantry Center
    DPW, EPMB

FROM: Georgia State Clearinghouse

DATE: 1/11/2005

SUBJECT: Executive Order 12372 Review

APPLICANT: U.S. Army - Fort Benning, GA

PROJECT: Final Draft EA/FONSI: Proposed Construction of Shopping Center at Fort Benning (contract no. HQ 00-PZC-013)

CFDA #: 

STATE ID: GA050111002

FEDERAL ID: 

Correspondence related to the above project was received by the Georgia State Clearinghouse on 1/11/2005. 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 2/9/2005 (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
MEMORANDUM

TO: US Departments of the Army and Air Force
   Army and Air Force Exchange
   Operations Center
   P.O. Box 225887
   Dallas, Texas 75222-5887

FROM: Karen Anderson-Córdova
   Unit Manager, Planning and Local Assistance
   Historic Preservation Division

RE: Finding of "No Historic Properties Affected"

PROJECT: EA/FONSI: Fort Benning, Construct Shopping Center
          Federal Agency: Army
          GA-050111-002

COUNTY: Muscogee County, Georgia

DATE: January 25, 2005

The Historic Preservation Division has reviewed the information received concerning the above-mentioned project. Our comments are offered to assist federal agencies and project applicants in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Based on the information submitted, HPD believes that no historic properties or archaeological resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be affected by this undertaking. Please note that historic and/or archaeological resources may be located within the project’s area of potential effect (APE), however, at this time it has been determined that they will not be impacted by the above-referenced project. Furthermore, any changes to this project as proposed will require further review by our office for compliance with the Section 106 process.

If we may be of further assistance contact Michelle Volkema, Environmental Review Specialist at (404) 651-6546 or Denise Messick, Environmental Review Historian at (404) 651-6777. Please refer to the project number assigned above in any future correspondence regarding this project.

KAC:mcv

cc: Barbara Jackson, Georgia State Clearinghouse
    Commander, Fort Benning
Comment:

Any on-site habitat suitable for the endangered plant relict trillium, Trillium reliquum, should be surveyed before construction is initiated, preferably during March 2005.

Steve Parris
Supervisory Fish and Wildlife Biologist
West Georgia Sub Office, Ecological Services
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P. O. Box 52560
Fort Benning, GA 31995
(706) 544-6999
FAX (706) 544-6419
Office of Planning and Budget

Sonny Perdue  
Governor

Timothy A. Connell  
Director

GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM
EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

TO: Melissa Kendrick  
U.S. Army Infantry Center  
DPW, EPMB

FROM: Barbara Jackson  
Georgia State Clearinghouse

DATE: 2/11/2005

SUBJECT: Executive Order 12372 Review

PROJECT: Final Draft EA/FONSI: Proposed Construction of Shopping Center at Fort Benning  
(contract no. HQ 00-PZC-013)

STATE ID: GA050111002

The applicant is advised that DNR’s: Water Protection Branch, Flood Plain Management, and  
Wildlife Resources Division were included in this review but did not comment within the review  
period. Should they later submit comments, we will forward to you.

The applicant is advised to note additional comments from DNR’s Historic Preservation Division.

/bj

Enc.: Lower Chattahoochee, Jan. 20, 2005  
Hazardous Waste Mgt, Jan. 28, 2005  
HPD, Feb. 1, 2005

Form NCC  
January 2004
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

APPLICANT: U.S. Army - Fort Benning, GA

PROJECT: Final Draft EA/FONSI: Proposed Construction of Shopping Center at Fort Benning (contract no. HQ 00-PZC-013)

STATE ID: GA050111002

DATE: January 18, 2005

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. [See Attached]

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.

RECEIVED  Form SC-3  
JAN 20 2005  
January 2005  
GEORGIA  
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
MEMORANDUM

To: Barbara Jackson
   Georgia State Clearinghouse

From: Planning Staff

Date: January 18, 2005

Re: Georgia State Clearinghouse – GA050111002
    Proposed Construction of Shopping Center at Fort Benning

Lower Chattahoochee RDC Planning Staff has reviewed the proposed project and has found it is not inconsistent with the RDC's Regional Plan or the City of Columbus' Comprehensive Plan.
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: MR. MARK SMITH
DNR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: Executive Order 12372 Review

APPLICANT: U.S. Army - Fort Benning, GA

PROJECT: Final Draft EA/FONSI: Proposed Construction of Shopping Center at Fort Benning (contract no. HQ 00-PZC-013)

STATE ID: GA050111002

DATE:

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.

RECEIVED

Form SC-3
JAN 28 2005
January 2005

GEORGIA
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
MEMORANDUM

TO: US Departments of the Army and Air Force
   Army and Air Force Exchange
   Operations Center
   P.O. Box 225887
   Dallas, Texas 75222-5887

FROM: Karen Anderson-Córdova
   Unit Manager, Planning and Local Assistance
   Historic Preservation Division

RE: Finding of "No Historic Properties Affected"

PROJECT: EA/FONSI: Fort Benning, Construct Shopping Center
   Federal Agency: Army
   GA-050111-002

COUNTY: Muscogee County, Georgia

DATE: January 25, 2005

The Historic Preservation Division has reviewed the information received concerning the above-mentioned project. Our comments are offered to assist federal agencies and project applicants in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Based on the information submitted, HPD believes that no historic properties or archaeological resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be affected by this undertaking. Please note that historic and/or archaeological resources may be located within the project's area of potential effect (APE), however, at this time it has been determined that they will not be impacted by the above-referenced project. Furthermore, any changes to this project as proposed will require further review by our office for compliance with the Section 106 process.

If we may be of further assistance contact Michelle Volkema, Environmental Review Specialist at (404) 651-6546 or Denise Messick, Environmental Review Historian at (404) 651-6777. Please refer to the project number assigned above in any future correspondence regarding this project.

KAC:mcv

cc: Barbara Jackson, Georgia State Clearinghouse
   Commander, Fort Benning

RECEIVED
FEB 01 2005

GEORGIA
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
Appendix C

USACE Nationwide Permit
July 6, 2004

Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Attention: Michael Gartman
220 West Garden St., Suite 404
Pensacola, Florida 32501

Dear Mr. Gartman:

I refer to your request on behalf of Fort Benning for Department of the Army authorization to impact 0.01 acre of wetlands to construct a new shopping center on Fort Benning, Chattahoochee County, Georgia. This project has been assigned number 200409330. Please refer to this number in any future correspondence.

The subject property contains waters of the United States, which are considered to be within the jurisdiction of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344). The placement of dredged or fill material into any waterways and/or their adjacent wetlands including material redeposited during mechanized land clearing or excavation of those wetlands would require prior Department of the Army authorization.

Based on our review of the information you furnished, I have determined that the proposed activity is authorized under Nationwide Permit No. 18 as described in Part B (18) of our Nationwide Permit Program which was published in the January 15, 2002, Federal Register, Vol. 67, No. 10, Pages 2020-2095 (67 FR), as amended on February 13 and 25, 2002. Your use of this Nationwide Permit is valid only if:

a. The activity is conducted in accordance with the information submitted and meets the conditions applicable to the Nationwide Permit, as described at Part C of the excerpt from 67 FR and the enclosed copy of the Savannah District Nationwide Permit Regional Conditions.

b. You obtain a stream buffer variance, if required. Variances are issued by the Director of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division, as defined in the Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act of 1975, as amended.

c. You fill out and sign the enclosed certification and return it to our office within 30 days of completion of the activity authorized by this permit.
This proposal was reviewed in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Based on the information we have available, we have determined that the project would have no effect on any threatened or endangered species nor any critical habitat for such species. Authorization of an activity by a Nationwide Permit does not authorize the "take" of threatened or endangered species.

This verification will be valid for a period of two years from the date of this letter, or until the Nationwide Permit is modified, reissued, or revoked, whichever occurs first. All of the Nationwide Permits are scheduled to expire on March 18, 2007. It is incumbent upon you to remain informed of changes to the Nationwide Permits. If you commence or are under contract to commence this activity before the date the Nationwide Permit is modified or revoked, you will have twelve months from the date of the modification or revocation to complete the activity under the present terms and conditions of this Nationwide Permit.

This authorization should not be construed to mean that any future projects requiring Department of the Army authorization would necessarily be authorized. Any new proposal, whether associated with this project or not, would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Any prior approvals would not be a determining factor in making a decision on any future request.

Revisions to your proposal may invalidate this authorization. In the event changes to this project are contemplated, I recommend that you coordinate with us prior to proceeding with the work.

This communication does not relieve you of any obligation or responsibility for complying with the provisions of any other laws or regulations of other federal, state, or local authorities. It does not affect your liability for any damages or claims that may arise as a result of the work. It does not convey any property rights, either in real estate or material, or any exclusive privileges. It also does not affect your liability for any interference with existing or proposed federal projects.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas C. Fischer
Senior Project Manager
Albany Field Office
CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE
WITH
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NATIONWIDE PERMIT (18)

PERMIT FILE NUMBER (if applicable): 200409330

PERMITTEE: Fort Benning

ADDRESS: Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Attention: Michael Gartman
220 West Garden St., Suite 404
Pensacola, Florida 32501

LOCATION OF WORK: Located near Upatoi Creek in Chattahoochee County, Georgia.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: To construct a shopping center.

ACRES OF WATERS OF THE US IMPACTED: 0.01

I understand that the permitted activity is subject to a US Army Corps of Engineers' Compliance Inspection. If I fail to comply with the permit conditions at Part C of the Nationwide Permit Program, published in the January 15, 2002, Federal Register, Vol. 67, No. 10, Pages 2020-2095, as amended on February 13 and 25, 2002, it may be subject to suspension, modification, or revocation.

I hereby certify that the work authorized by the above referenced permit as well as any required mitigation (if applicable) has been completed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the said permit.

_____________________________________________________
Signature of Permittee/Date
Appendix D

Air Quality Analysis Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Alternative (Alternative 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction (square feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Paved Area (acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Area (acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building (sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paved areas (sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Impact Area (Acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction: 20 months = 1.67 years
250 work days per year
417.5 total days
### Table D-2

**Mobile Equipment Exhaust Emissions**

*Preferred Alternative (Alternative 7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Equipment List</th>
<th>Days Used</th>
<th>NOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>CO (lbs/day)</th>
<th>SO2 (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>NOx (tons/year)</th>
<th>VOC (tons/year)</th>
<th>CO (tons/year)</th>
<th>SO2 (tons/year)</th>
<th>PM10 (tons/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Loader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>337.50</td>
<td>2317.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haul Truck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>5667.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe Excavation</td>
<td>Backhoe Loader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1685.00</td>
<td>890.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haul Truck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>5667.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut and fill</td>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.39</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>8847.50</td>
<td>5395.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>462.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>9362.50</td>
<td>5007.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>482.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Truck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>5667.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Trencher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2077.50</td>
<td>1815.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4105.00</td>
<td>2772.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>217.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>9362.50</td>
<td>5007.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>482.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Truck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>5667.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Slab pouring</td>
<td>Cement Truck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>5667.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Equipment</td>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2077.50</td>
<td>1815.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2077.50</td>
<td>1815.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Paving Machine Roller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2977.50</td>
<td>2340.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2077.50</td>
<td>1815.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Equipment List</th>
<th>Days Used</th>
<th>NOx (lbs/day)</th>
<th>CO (lbs/day)</th>
<th>SO2 (lbs/day)</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>NOx (tons/year)</th>
<th>VOC (tons/year)</th>
<th>CO (tons/year)</th>
<th>SO2 (tons/year)</th>
<th>PM10 (tons/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Total equipment in use per day: 17
- **CO** = Carbon monoxide.
- **lbs** = Pounds.
- **TPY** = Tons per year.
- **VOC** = Volatile organic compound.

---

**Table D-2 Notes:**

- **CO** = Carbon monoxide.
- **lbs** = Pounds.
- **TPY** = Tons per year.
- **VOC** = Volatile organic compound.
- **PM10** = Particulate matter (10 microns or less).
- **SO2** = Sulfur dioxide.
- **NOx** = Nitrogen oxides.
- **PM10** = Particulate matter (10 microns or less).
- **SO2** = Sulfur dioxide.
- **TPY** = Tons per year.
- **VOC** = Volatile organic compound.
Table D-3
Annual Site Preparation Particulate Emissions for Construction
Preferred Alternative (Alternative 7)

| Acres Impacted | Activity Days | Bulldozing \(a\) 2508 | Pan Scraping Soil Removal \(b\) 352 | Pan Scraping Earth Moving \(c\) 222 | Emissions \(d\) lbs/year 3082 | TPY 1.54 |

Notes:
\(a\) Bulldothing dust emissions based on 8-hour/activity day times \((x)\) Emissions Factor (EPA 1992)
\(b\) Soil removal dust emissions based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT)/acre times \((X)\) acres times \((X)\) Emissions Factor (EPA 1992)
\(c\) Earthmoving dust emissions based on soil removal miles times \((X)\) 3 (BEE) times \((X)\) Emissions Factor.
\(d\) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 1992 Fugitive Dust Background document (EPA-450/2-92-004) used as data reference.

Key:
lbs = pounds.
TPY = tons per year.
### Table D-4
Annual Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions from Paving<sup>a</sup>
Preferred Alternative (Alternative 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres Paved</th>
<th>Emission Factor (lbs/acre/day)</th>
<th>EMISSIONS lbs/year&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TPY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>372.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Emission Factor = 2.62 lbs per acre per day.

<sup>b</sup> assumes paving will take place for 10 days.

Key:
- lbs = pounds.
- TPY = tons per year.
Appendix E

Finding of No Significant Impact
1. Description of the Proposed Action: The Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) propose to construct a new shopping center for use by authorized individuals at Fort Benning. The proposed action would consist of construction and operation of a shopping center containing a main store, MCSS and a food court including an Anthony’s Pizza, Robin Hood Deli, Burger King, Taco Bell, Church’s Chicken, Manchu Wok, Charley’s Grilled Subs, A & W, and Baskin Robbins. Services would include a barber shop, beauty shop, pharmacy, alterations shop, optometrist/eye care office, flower shop, one-hour photo store, nutrition center, shoe store, amusement arcade, beauty supply, collectibles, roving concessions, category enhancer, and local artisan.

New construction would consist of reinforced concrete slab/foundation with masonry/metal stud exterior walls, steel structure and built-up partitions, AAFES-provided shelving, suspended ceilings and recessed energy-efficient lighting. Exterior support would include required utilities, communications, paving, walks, curbs, storm drainage, site improvements, electrical, mechanical, and fire protection for a complete and usable facility. Only AAFES-authorized patrons would use the facility. These patrons are primarily active duty and retired military personnel, their family members, and certain categories of reserve military personnel.

2. Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI): the EA titled "Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Construction of a Shopping Center, Fort Benning, Georgia," was prepared and evaluated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (Public law 91-190, 42 USC. 4321 et seq.). This EA concluded that the proposed action does not constitute a "major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the natural and human environment" when considered individually or cumulatively in the context of the referenced Act, including both direct and indirect impacts. Therefore, the preparation of a more detailed environmental document, an Environmental Impact Statement, was not required.

3. Summary of Potential Environmental Effects and Proposed Mitigation for Revised Alternative III:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>POTENTIAL EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Minor adverse effects</td>
<td>Adherence to ES&amp;PC, NPDES Permit, and SPCC Plan required; no additional mitigation proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Minor adverse effects</td>
<td>Adherence to ES&amp;PC and NPDES Permit required; no additional mitigation proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>Minor adverse effects</td>
<td>Adherence to ES&amp;PC, NPDES Permit, and SPCC Plan required; no additional mitigation proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>Minor adverse effects</td>
<td>USACE Nationwide Permit and coordination; no additional mitigation proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species of Conservation</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>None proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESOURCE** | **POTENTIAL EFFECT** | **MITIGATION**
---|---|---
Air Quality | Minor adverse effects | Adherence to applicable air permits and regulations; no additional mitigation proposed.
Noise | Minor adverse effect | Adverse effects would be minimized by limiting construction activity to daylight hours and by using properly maintained and muffled equipment. Noise associated with implementation of the proposed action at the preferred alternative site would be limited primarily to construction and would represent a localized short-term adverse effect; no additional mitigation is proposed.
Hazardous Materials and Waste | No effect | None proposed.
Cultural Resources | No effect | None proposed.
Socioeconomics | Minor Positive effect | None proposed.
Infrastructure and Utilities | No effect | None proposed.

### 4. Public Comments:

a. An interim draft of the EA and FNSI for the proposed action were erroneously presented to the public for review from 12 January through 11 February 2005; a notice of availability (NOA) of these document was also posted in “The Columbus Ledger-Enquirer” during this time, in accordance with part 1501.4 (e)(1) of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and 32 CFR part 651 (Army Regulation 200-2). The documents were available at the Columbus Public Library, South Lumpkin Library, Fort Benning Main Post Library, and on the Installation website. The NOA was also mailed to all agencies/individuals/organizations on the distribution (mailing) list for the proposed action. In response to these efforts, the following comments were received:

- On January 10, 2005, a private citizen responded to our notice. Some individuals were interested in having retail banking services.
- On January 11, 2005, the Georgia State Clearinghouse (GSC) sent a letter confirming receipt of the EA and draft FNSI and that the documents would be forwarded, through them, for the appropriate state level reviews.
- On January 18, 2005, the Lower Chattahoochee Regional Development Center responded via letter that the proposed project is not consistent with the RD’s Regional Plan or the City of Columbus’ Comprehensive Plan.
- On January 25, 2005, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division indicated via letter that based upon the information provided the HPD believes that no historic properties or archaeological resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be affected by this undertaking. Please note that historic and/or archaeological resources may be located within the project’s area of potential effect (APE), however, at this time it has been
determined that they would not be impacted by this project. Any changes to this project as proposed would require further review by our office for compliance with Section 106 process.

- An email comment was received from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on 7 February 2005 requesting that any on-site habitat suitable for the endangered plant relict trillium (*Trillium reliquum*) be surveyed before construction is initiated, preferably during March 2005. Fort Benning and AAFES will work together to ensure that this survey is conducted, per USFWS request and during the desired period of time.
- On February 11, 2005, a letter from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Hazardous Waste Management Branch, indicated that based upon the information provided the project 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.

The Corrected Final EA and draft FNSI are now available for public and stakeholder review and will be at the aforementioned libraries and on the Installation website (https://www-benning.army.mil/EMD/_program_mgt/legal/index.htm) starting 30 days from the first date of publication in “The Columbus Ledger Enquirer”. The NOA will also be re-distributed to all parties on the distribution (mailing) list and, when final, the resulting comments will be incorporated into the Final FNSI.

b. Summary of additional comments: reserved until the completion of the 2nd public and stakeholder comment period.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ricardo R. Riera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garrison Commander</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Public Involvement Plan
Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Construction
of a Shopping Center
Fort Benning, Georgia

Public and Stakeholder Involvement Plan (PIP)
14 December 2004

1. PURPOSE.

1.1 Need for Project. The proposed action is to better serve the needs of the military community through the improvement of shopping facilities on Fort Benning. The Post Exchange (PX) facility was built in 1973 and is part of the PX and commissary complex, which is 95,000 square feet and includes a gas station, parking lots, and other services. The PX and commissary complex facility is located on a site bounded by Marne Road to the north, I-185 to the west, Hamlet Creek to the north, and undeveloped property to the east and south (Figure 2-2).

Currently, the Post Exchange (PX) is located in a confined space adjacent to the commissary, is highly congested, and too small to adequately serve the customer base. All AAFES food stores require substantial upgrades to meet the current retail standards AAFES requires at its newer facilities. Mechanical equipment is antiquated and the roof routinely leaks. To meet current AAFES retail standards, AAFES proposes to construct a new shopping center to solve the sizing, overcrowding, and maintenance problems, while maintaining easy access and locating the facility near the existing commissary and other associated services.

1.2 Need for Public and Stakeholder Involvement Plan. The construction and operation of the AAFES shopping center on Fort Benning involves legally mandated public comment and document review periods, as well as an opportunity to proactively identify and address any 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 completing the proposed action. Throughout this Plan, “public” is used to broadly describe individuals that are in communities near the proposed project site or that may be interested or affected by the proposed action. “Stakeholder” is used to identify those entities that have an additional relationship to Fort Benning environmental resources or regulatory or governmental duties. Stakeholders include the Federally recognized American Indian Tribes associated with the Fort Benning area; Federal, state and local governmental agencies with regulatory authority over Fort Benning (e.g. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Georgia State Historic Preservation Office); 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, because no significant affects are anticipated, an EA is being prepared.
The Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) has NEPA oversight for the Federal government and has published regulations and guidance for the preparation of an EA. 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 EA 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 opportunities for public participation, often called public scoping, during preparation of an EA. Public interaction is based on two-way communication that reflects the needs of the community, and may utilize such methods as notices, brochures, news releases, web page information, summaries, draft documents, public meetings, comments and/or other methods. Fort Benning should update the community 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 several other laws and regulations that require public notices and participation during the planning phases of a Federal project and some may be relevant to this proposed activity. Although NEPA may address some of the topics and issues in the EA, Fort Benning must still satisfy the requirements of these other laws and regulations. Additional requirements for public or stakeholder involvement, in this instance, may include Federal and state laws, regulations, or executive orders and Installation policies and guidelines addressing the following: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Concurrence for affects to historic properties); a Section 404 of the Clean Water Act permitting wetland disturbance; NPDES construction and stormwater permits; and a Spill Prevention, Control, and Counter-Measure Plan (SPCC). 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 opportunities (see section 1.2.2) will be woven into the existing framework for the NEPA public involvement.

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, Fort Benning’s environmental stewardship, the construction of the proposed action, and any proposed mitigation that is 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 email 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 needs of the community 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 meeting the legal requirements and also takes measures for more meaningful communication and involvement of the public and stakeholders in the planning of the construction of the proposed AAFES shopping mall. Limitations in resources, personnel, and time impose constraints that necessitate an efficient and realistic Plan. This Plan must assist the planners and be realistic for implementation. Goals for this Plan include:
• Promote an understanding of public and stakeholder involvement requirements and opportunities for better resourcing and scheduling;
• Specify steps needed to meet legal responsibilities for comment opportunities of public members and stakeholders;
• List realistic time frames and responsible persons or offices for each step;
• 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;
• Incorporate opportunities to present information to better partner with the community; and
• Keep PAO 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 may 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 action 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. 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 proposed construction and operation of the AAFES shopping mall, AAFES has been identified as the proponent. As the project planning progresses, other 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. AAFES is preparing the environmental planning and documentation.

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 144-R 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.

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 EA. 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 EMD and DPW will keep the Public Affairs Officer (PAO) at Fort Benning informed regarding environmental planning and scoping for the proposed AAFES construction project. It is the responsibility of the Fort Benning PAO to keep the Installation Management Agency (IMA), via the South East Regional Office (SERO), informed of this action and its progress.

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, 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 SEA processing. For the proposed privatization process, Fort Benning has taken the basic Mailing List and adjusted it accordingly. 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 proposed privatization process. 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 proposed action.

4. PREPARATION OF THE EA AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI).

4.1. Involvement in Development of the EA. The EA is the environmental analysis document that is available for public review and comment in the NEPA process for this proposed action. While several partial drafts of the NEPA document may be routed for review at the Installation level, the first NEPA document to leave the installation for IMA/SERO and public review is the EA and draft FNSI. It should be the best attempt to inform the public and incorporate any scoping from the Preliminary Phase into the environmental analysis.

4.2. Preparation of the EA.

4.2.1. Drafting the NEPA Document. The EA should follow the general format in AR 200-2 although variations can be made as long as all required information and analysis are included. Environmental analysis in the EA requires reliable information regarding the project design. Developing the EA simultaneously with other environmental planning requirements is efficient and credible.

4.2.2. Gathering information. Much information can be obtained from existing sources, however additional surveys and/or analysis may 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 EA.

4.2.3. 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 would be incorporated into the EA, 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 text of the document should be available for public review when the EA is made publicly available. 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.

4.2.4. Coordinating with Others: The EA internal Army review should involve DPW, Master Planning, and the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate (OSJA). See AR 200-2 651.45(d)(2) for more information.

4.2.5. Cooperating Agencies. At this time, there are no cooperating agencies involved in the NEPA for the AAFES shopping mall construction.

5. THE FINAL PHASE.

After the close of the timeframe for public comment on the EA and draft FNSI, the Final Phase begins. Comments are considered and any revisions must be incorporated, either by errata sheets for minor revisions or complete revision and production of a revised EA for more comprehensive changes.

5.1. Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI). No decision will be made until 30 days after the Draft EA is made available for public review and comment. The Draft FNSI 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. See AR 200-2, Section 651.35(c) for more information.

5.2. Mitigation and Monitoring. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements will be identified in the EA and FNSI. Point of contact for requesting this information is the Fort Benning Public Affairs Office (PAO).

Prepared By:
Army and Air Force Exchange Service