

**U.S. Army
Multi-Domain
Task Force Stationing**



**FINAL FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR THE
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR
MULTI-DOMAIN TASK FORCE STATIONING**



**PREPARED FOR
HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**

September 2022

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INTRODUCTION

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 United States (U.S.) Code Section 4321 et seq.) requires federal agencies to consider potential environmental impacts prior to undertaking a course of action.

The Department of the Army (Army) prepared a Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) in accordance with NEPA, the regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508 (40 CFR § 1500-1508), and the Army's procedures for implementing NEPA, Environmental Analysis of Army Actions (32 CFR Part 651).

This PEA is titled "Programmatic Environmental Assessment for U.S. Army Multi-Domain Task Force Stationing." This PEA is incorporated by reference in this Final Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and has been developed to analyze the potential environmental consequences that could result from implementation of the Full and Base configurations of the Multi-Domain Task Force (MDTF) stationing action at 13 Army Garrisons and joint base installations. During development of the MDTF concept, the Army determined that two MDTF configurations would be required. The Base MDTF configuration is the smaller of the two configurations that includes infrastructure or space for headquarters and maintenance facilities as well as requirements for an Intelligence, Cyber, Electronic Warfare, and Space detachment. The Full MDTF configuration requires the same components as the Base MDTF configuration but with additional units and personnel. The Full MDTF configuration also includes additional airspace, range, and airfield requirements.

The 13 Army Garrisons and joint base installations include: Fort Bliss, Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Carson, Fort Drum, Fort Hood, Fort Knox, Fort Riley, Fort Stewart, Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM), Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER), U.S. Army Garrison (USAG) Hawai'i and Fort Wainwright. Due to the understanding of space limitations at USAG Hawai'i at the time the alternatives for the PEA were developed, only the Base MDTF configuration was analyzed for this installation.

The intent of the MDTF is to create a modernized Army capable of conducting multi-domain operations as part of an integrated Joint Force that is ready to conduct multi-domain operations across an array of scenarios in multiple theaters by 2035.

The PEA provides a broad and programmatic analysis to determine potential impacts on the environmental and socioeconomic areas of concern at each of the 13 installations under consideration. The PEA also considers the general capacity of each installation to support the MDTF stationing action given the existing baseline conditions at each installation. The programmatic approach is designed to allow for early planning, coordination, and flexibility throughout implementation of the Army's process of stationing the MDTF configurations.

Decisions on where to station the MDTF configurations will be made by Army decision-makers based on the information in this PEA/FONSI as well as other mission-related considerations.

PROPOSED ACTION

The Army's Proposed Action is the stationing of the MDTF. The MDTF is an essential step in the realization of the Army Modernization Strategy (AMS) outline for transforming the Army into a multi-domain force by 2035. In order to implement the AMS, the Army first defined the requirements and components of the MDTF. The MDTF is built around a Field Artillery Brigade

and consists of integrating enhanced cyber and electronic warfare capabilities with long-range, land-based missile and rocketry forces. The MDTF requires installations, facilities, communication, and cyber capabilities; soldiers; weapons systems, including aerial capabilities; and infrastructure. The MDTF facility requirements include brigade, battalion, and company headquarters facilities, tactical equipment maintenance facilities, and vehicle maintenance shops. In addition, to accommodate the cyber and electronic warfare capabilities, the MDTF requires a sensitive compartmented information facility and an intelligence, cyber, electronic warfare, and space administration facility.

Although the personnel and facility requirements for the MDTF have been developed, the MDTF weapons systems training doctrine requirements are under development and not available at this time. As such, the Proposed Action for the PEA does not include any MDTF training activities. When the MDTF weapons systems training doctrine requirements are developed, they will be compared against installation-specific ongoing training to determine if additional environmental analysis would be required. Simulators for weapon systems may be used, as required.

Proposed Action Alternatives

Along with the No Action Alternative, the PEA evaluated two action Alternatives, stationing the Full MDTF configuration and stationing the Base MDTF configuration. The alternatives considered and analyzed in the PEA are described in more detail below.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative is required by CEQ regulations and provides baseline conditions and a benchmark against which to compare environmental impacts from the Proposed Action alternatives (40 CFR § 1502.14(c)). Implementation of the No Action Alternative would mean that neither the Full nor the Base MDTF configurations would be permanently established at any Army or joint installation. Although implementation of the No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose and need or the objectives of the AMS, the No Action Alternative serves as the baseline for the comparison of potential impacts to all resource areas. Under the No Action Alternative, the Army would not enhance its structural Multi-Domain Operations capabilities and would continue to face challenges competing with near-peer adversaries in current warfare strategies. In addition, infrastructure at each of the 13 installations would remain unchanged.

Alternative 1. Full MDTF Configuration Alternative

Alternative 1 is implementation of the Full MDTF configuration. Implementation of the Full MDTF configuration requires up to approximately 93 acres of compatible facility capacity or space available for new construction. Table 2-1 of the PEA identifies the different facilities required as part of the Full MDTF configuration. Examples of some of these facilities include battalion headquarters facilities, company operations facilities, Temporary Equipment Maintenance Facilities, and the addition of up to 3,000 soldiers. The MDTF weapons systems training doctrine requirements are still under development and are not available at this time. Once the MDTF weapon systems training doctrine requirements have been developed, they will be compared against installation-specific ongoing training to determine if additional environmental analysis would be required.

Alternative 2. Base MDTF Configuration Alternative

Alternative 2 is implementation of the Base MDTF configuration. Implementation of the Base MDTF configuration requires up to approximately 18 acres of compatible facility capacity or space

available for new construction. Table 2-2 of the PEA identifies the different facilities required as part of the Base MDTF configuration. The Base MDTF configuration alternative has a smaller footprint than the Full MDTF configuration and would include the addition of up to 400 soldiers.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Each of the resource areas identified in Table F-1 was analyzed for potential impacts resulting from implementing the Proposed Action and any cumulative effects. Potential impacts that could result from the implementation of actions can be both beneficial and adverse. The degree of environmental beneficial and adverse impacts is characterized as: none, negligible, minor, moderate, significant, and significant but mitigable.

Impacts are anticipated to be minimized through avoidance, and the implementation of existing environmental protection measures. Avoidance strategies depend on the installation selected, the increase in the number of soldiers at the installation, and where construction activities are planned. Examples of environmental protection measures would include implementing erosion and stormwater control measures; maintaining vehicles and equipment; and sustaining vegetation cover at the construction sites. Buffers for sensitive resources (biological and cultural) are employed during construction, depending on the requirements of the installation.

After the Army identifies stationing decisions, garrison planners would determine how best to apply the MDTF concept analyzed in this PEA to an installation-specific location and configuration at their garrison. When multiple locations are available, installation planners would evaluate the locations and then select a final location. A checklist (see Appendix B of the PEA) has been developed for installations to tier from this PEA and associated FONSI to determine if reliance on this PEA and possibly other NEPA analyses and one or more categorical exclusions is appropriate or if additional NEPA analysis is needed before implementing a proposed action. The checklist would then be applied to that location and the MDTF configuration. If the installation can respond “no” to each of the statements in the checklist, then no further NEPA analysis would be required and the action would likely qualify for an installation-specific Record of Environmental Consideration, incorporating the analyses and the signed FONSI for this PEA. If the installation checks “yes” to one or more statements in the checklist, planners at the installation can reconsider both the sites and layout of the proposed development, or implement other mitigation, to determine if the effect on the resource area(s) could be avoided and the answer changed to “no.” If application of the checklist to the proposed stationing action at an installation requires a “yes” response to any checklist statement and the impact(s) cannot be reduced (e.g., by moving the proposed developments or changing the scale of development), then additional environmental analysis could be required. The Army will continue to adhere to legal and regulatory requirements, and continue to implement its approved management plans, standard operation procedures, and best management practices.

With implementation of identified mitigation measures below and pending further evaluation of installation-specific design plans, no significant impacts are anticipated to result from implementing the Proposed Action at any of the 13 installations assessed in this PEA.

Based on the analysis contained in this PEA, it was determined that certain actions at certain installations would be required to mitigate potential impacts to various resource areas such that impacts would be less than significant. These actions are described by resource area and by installation as listed below.

- Air Quality
 - No mitigation required at any of the 13 installations.
- Biological Resources
 - Fort Bragg. Full MDTF configuration. Once the final installation-specific design plans have been developed, surveys would be completed to determine the potential for impacts to rare plant species and foraging habitat for the red-cockaded woodpecker. Should impacts to federally listed species be unavoidable then Fort Bragg would implement procedures listed in the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) including but not limited to the initiation of Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
 - JBLM. Full MDTF configuration. Once the final installation-specific design plans have been developed, surveys would be completed to determine the potential impacts to federally listed threatened or endangered species. Should impacts to federally listed species be unavoidable then JBLM would implement procedures listed in the INRMP including but not limited to the initiation of Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation with the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service, as needed.
- Cultural Resources
 - Fort Campbell. Full and Base MDTF configurations. Once the final installation-specific design plans have been developed, comprehensive cultural surveys would be completed to determine if any of the proposed MDTF facilities would impact National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible resources or the Clarksville Base Historic District. If the historic district or any NRHP-eligible resources are identified to be potentially affected, Section 106 consultation would be initiated. Fort Campbell has a Programmatic Agreement with the Tennessee State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding development, construction, and operations within the historic district. This agreement requires coordination once the installation-specific design plans are available and a determination of effect could be made for the District at that time.
 - JBLM, Full MDTF configuration. Once the final installation-specific engineered design plans have been developed, surveys would be completed to determine if any MDTF facilities would affect the Historic Garrison District and the McChord Field Historic District. Projects in these districts would be coordinated with the SHPO and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. If necessary, a Memorandum of Agreement would be developed to identify if changes to the exterior of historic buildings, including doors, as well as some interior modifications would require mitigation. Should potential impacts to historic buildings be unavoidable then those impacts would be coordinated with the SHPO and ACHP and impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.
 - JBER, Full and Base MDTF configurations. Once the final installation-specific design plans have been developed, comprehensive cultural surveys would be completed to determine if any of the proposed MDTF facilities would adversely affect any cultural resources. Should follow-up studies determine that NRHP-eligible resources are located in the proposed project locations and it is determined that these resources would be adversely affected by the final design of the proposed MDTF facilities, then appropriate mitigation would be completed to reduce to impacts to less than significant.

- Soils
 - No mitigation required at any of the 13 installations.
- Land Use
 - No mitigation required at any of the 13 installations.
- Socioeconomics
 - No mitigation required at any of the 13 installations.
- Traffic and Transportation
 - No mitigation required at any of the 13 installations.
- Infrastructure and Utilities
 - Fort Wainwright, Full MDTF configuration. Once the final installation-specific design plans have been developed, the need for expansion of utility systems would be evaluated. A complete and accurate utilities Service Application along with approved funding to construct the needed utility systems would reduce impacts to infrastructure and utility systems to less than significant.
- Water Resources
 - JBLM, Full MDTF configuration. Impacts to water resources would be reduced to less than significant through the incorporation of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit requirements and low impact development best management practices into final installation- specific design plans. In addition, all construction would be completed in accordance with the JBLM Stormwater Design Guidance document to ensure compliance with permit requirements.

PUBLIC REVIEW AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Introduction

The PEA and Draft FONSI were made available for public, agency, and Tribal review on June 22, 2022, when a Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register. Notices were also published in local newspapers near each installation. That same day, copies of the PEA and draft FONSI were made available in local libraries and for download from the United States Army Environmental Command (USAEC) website at: <https://aec.army.mil/index.php?cID=352>.

Comments were requested to be submitted by July 22, 2022, to: U.S. Army Environmental Command Attn: MDTF Public Comments, 2455 Reynolds Road, Mail Stop 112 JBSA-Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7588.

Comments were requested to be sent by email to usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.nepa@army.mil with the subject line MDTF Public Comment. Questions were requested to be sent to usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.public-mailbox@army.mil or by phone at 210-466-1590 or 210-488-6061.

The document was available for download from the USAEC's website at <https://aec.army.mil/index.php?cID=352>. Copies of the document could be requested from usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.public-mailbox@army.mil or via mail at U.S. Army Environmental Command, Attn: Public Affairs, 2455 Reynolds Rd Mail Stop 112, JBSA-Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7588.

Comments Received and Responses

During the public comment period, a total of 198 comments on the PEA and draft FONSI were received. Table 1-1 in the PEA provides a summary of the comments by installation. None of the comments presented significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. In addition, none of the comments presented information that demonstrated there were significant impacts from the MDTF alternatives.

CONCLUSION

Based on a careful review of the PEA, which is incorporated by reference, and comments received as a result of the June 22, 2022, Notice of Availability publication, I have determined that no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to the human or natural environment are anticipated to result from implementation of either the Full MDTF configuration alternative at Fort Bliss, Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Carson, Fort Drum, Fort Hood, Fort Knox, Fort Riley, Fort Stewart, JBLM, JBER, and Fort Wainwright, or the Base MDTF configuration alternative at Fort Bliss, Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Carson, Fort Drum, Fort Hood, Fort Knox, Fort Riley, Fort Stewart, JBLM, JBER, USAG Hawai'i, and Fort Wainwright.

I conclude that the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative are not likely to have significant effects per 40 CFR 1501.3(a)(2) and that an environmental impact statement is not required, and will not be prepared. My decision is based on the analysis contained within the PEA, taking into consideration comments received during the public comment period. This decision complies with legal requirements and has been made after taking into account all submitted information and considering a full range of reasonable alternatives and all environmental impacts.



Date



Date

Table F-1: Summary of the Effects from Both of the Action Alternatives

Installation	Resource Area																	
	Air Quality		Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Soils		Land Use		Socioeconomics		Traffic and Transportation		Infrastructure and Utilities		Water Resources	
	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base	Full	Base
Fort Bliss	M	N	N	N	N	N	M	M	N	N	N, M, B	MO	MO	N, M	N, M	M	M	
Fort Bragg	M	N	SM	MO	N	N	M	M	N	N	M	M, MO	N	N	N	M	M	
Fort Campbell	M	N	M	N	MO, M	MO, M	M	M	M	M	M, MO	M	M	N, M	N, M	M	M	
Fort Carson	M	N	M	M	MO	MO	M	M	N	N	M, MO	M	M	MO	N, M	MO	MO	
Fort Drum	M	N	M	N	N	N	M	M	N	N	N, M, B	N	N	M	M	M	M	
Fort Hood	M	N	M	M	N	N	M	M	N	N	MO	M	M	M	N, M	MO	M	
Fort Knox	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	M	MO	MO	N	N	N	N	
Fort Riley	M	N	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N, M, B	MO	MO	M, B	N, M	M, MO	M	
Fort Stewart	M	N	M	M	N	N	M	M	N	N	N, M	N	N	N, M	N	M	M	
Joint Base Lewis-McChord	M	N	SM	MO	SM	MO	M	M	M, MO	M	M	N	N	M	N	SM	SM	
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	M	N	M	M	MO, SM	MO, SM	M	M	M, MO	M	M, MO	M	M	N, M	N	N	N	
USAG Hawai'i	NA	N	NA	N	NA	M	NA	M	NA	N	NA	M	NA	NA	M	NA	NA	
Fort Wainwright	M	N	N	N	M	M	M	M	M, B	M, B	MO, B	N	M, MO	M, MO	SM	M	M	

Key: B = beneficial; M = minor; MDTF = Multi-Domain Task Force; MO = Moderate/less than significant; N = negligible/no impact; NA = Not Applicable; S = significant; SM = significant but mitigable; USAG = U.S. Army Garrison.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK