

1 **DRAFT**

2 **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR ARMY 2020 FORCE**  
3 **STRUCTURE REALIGNMENT**

4 **June 2014**

5 The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires federal agencies to consider  
6 potential environmental impacts prior to undertaking a course of action. NEPA is implemented  
7 through regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 Code of  
8 Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508) and within the United States (U.S.) Department of  
9 the Army (Army) by 32 CFR Part 651, *Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*. In accordance  
10 with these requirements, the Army has prepared a Supplemental Programmatic Environmental  
11 Assessment (SPEA) to consider environmental effects on installations that could result from  
12 implementation of the Proposed Action to realign Army forces from Fiscal Year (FY) 2013  
13 through FY 2020. The SPEA was prepared as a supplemental NEPA evaluation to the Army’s  
14 2013 Programmatic Environmental Assessment (2013 PEA) due to changes to the Purpose and  
15 Need described in the previous document.

16 **1.0 Title of the Action**

17 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Army 2020 Force  
18 Structure Realignment.

19 **2.0 Background Information**

20 To analyze the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with the initial  
21 realignment targets, the Army prepared a PEA titled *Programmatic Environmental Assessment*  
22 *for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment* in 2013. The 2013 PEA analyzed a proposed action  
23 consisting of a reduction in active Army end-strength from 562,000 to 490,000. While the 2013  
24 PEA analyzed reductions beyond those required to reach an end-strength of 490,000, the 2013  
25 PEA indicated that analyzing the numbers studied provided flexibility to decision makers over  
26 the ensuing years as conditions change, including fiscal, policy, and security considerations that  
27 were beyond the scope of the Army to control. In April 2013, a Finding of No Significant Impact  
28 (FNSI) was signed based on the 2013 PEA analysis.

29 As discussed in the 2013 PEA, the Army’s proposed action (Army 2020 realignment) was to  
30 conduct force reductions and force realignments to a size and configuration that was capable of  
31 meeting national security and defense objectives, implement the 2010 Quadrennial Defense  
32 Review (QDR) recommendations, sustain unit equipment and training readiness, and preserve a  
33 high quality of life for active component Soldiers and their Families. The Army’s civilian  
34 workforce would also be reduced. Army 2020 realignment also allowed for the adjustment of  
35 forces to meet requirements in high demand military occupational specialties, while rebalancing  
36 the number and types of units in lower priority military occupational specialties. Implementation  
37 of Army 2020 realignment, as assessed in the 2013 PEA, enabled the Army to reduce its

1 operational costs with a smaller force that still could meet the mission requirements of the then-  
2 current and future global security environment. Reductions and realignments were required to  
3 achieve the savings specified in the 2011 Budget Control Act. To achieve these savings, the  
4 Army proposed to reduce the size of its force from a post-9/11 peak of about 570,000 in 2010 to  
5 490,000. In June 2013, the Army announced the inactivation of 10 Regular Army Brigade  
6 Combat Teams (BCTs) in the continental U.S. Five of these BCTs are scheduled to be  
7 inactivated in FY 2014 and five in FY 2015. In addition to BCT reductions on U.S. installations,  
8 reductions were achieved through the elimination of Soldiers in temporary, wartime over-  
9 strength categories and drawdown of overseas forces, the latter of which reduced the impact of  
10 these force reductions on U.S. installations.

11 Since the 2013 PEA was completed, Department of Defense (DoD) fiscal guidance has  
12 continued to change, and the future end-strength of the Army must be reduced even further than  
13 the 490,000 considered in the 2013 PEA. The 2014 QDR states that the active Army will reduce  
14 from its war-time high of 570,000 to 440,000–450,000 Soldiers. The 2014 QDR also states if  
15 sequestration-level cuts are imposed in FY 2016 and beyond, active component end-strength  
16 would need to be reduced to 420,000. These further potential reductions from the authorized  
17 2012 baseline end-strength of 562,000, therefore, call for an environmental and socioeconomic  
18 impact analysis of approximately two times the reductions analyzed in the 2013 PEA. In other  
19 words, the 2013 PEA analyzed reductions totaling approximately 72,000 (reducing the Army's  
20 end-strength from 562,000 to approximately 490,000); the QDR requires analysis of further  
21 reductions totaling 70,000 (reducing the Army's end-strength from 490,000 to 420,000). As a  
22 result, the Army has prepared this SPEA, building on the information and analysis contained in  
23 the 2013 PEA, to assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of a substantial increase  
24 in potential reductions. This does not mean that these losses will actually occur to the full extent  
25 analyzed or that each installation analyzed will incur losses. The Proposed Action for this SPEA  
26 is very similar to the reduction alternative in the 2013 PEA but is both broader in scope and  
27 allows for deeper potential reductions. The Army recognizes that these cuts down to 420,000  
28 Soldiers could have serious impacts to the communities that host the Nation's force, and this  
29 document is intended to determine and disclose those impacts.

30 The SPEA analyzes the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with  
31 realignment of the Army's force structure between FY 2013 and FY 2020 that protects and  
32 advances U.S. interests and sustains U.S. leadership within the fiscal constraints of decreased  
33 DoD funding. In making these force structure decisions, the Army must consider how best to  
34 make trade-offs between programs and operations, while strategically moving forward to  
35 preserve mission capabilities and modernize the force to meet future threats. The SPEA presents  
36 an overarching perspective that provides decision makers, as well as regulatory agencies and the  
37 public, with information about the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts, thereby  
38 enabling them to assess and compare those impacts. Decision makers will be able to make  
39 informed decisions and identify locations to reduce existing force structure or realign units.

### 3.0 Description of Proposed Action

The Army's Proposed Action is to reduce and realign its forces, both active component Soldiers and Army civilian employees, to attempt to meet current and future national security and defense requirements as outlined in the 2014 QDR. The implementation of Army 2020 realignment with the reduced Army end-strength as indicated in the 2014 QDR will be necessary to operate on a reduced budget.

### 4.0 Alternatives

In addition to the No Action Alternative, one action alternative has been formulated that considers the Army's needs for Army 2020 realignment.

#### **Alternative 1—Implement Force Reductions**

Under Alternative 1, the Army would reduce its end-strength to as low as 420,000 as indicated in the 2014 QDR (assuming sequestration-level cuts are resumed in FY 2016).<sup>1</sup> Table FNSI-1 presents the potential active component Soldier and Army civilian employee reductions that could occur at each of 30 locations considered under Alternative 1. These reductions are used as the maximum potential force reduction thresholds for each installation, thereby providing force structure decision makers with options as they consider what best serves the Nation's defense prior to determining the units and locations to be affected by reductions. The 30 locations include 21 that were analyzed for potential reductions under the 2013 PEA. The 30 locations were studied because they have the potential to lose 1,000 or more active component Soldiers and Army civilian employees. The studied reductions for all 30 locations, if added together, would reduce the Army's active force to well below 400,000. Such deep reductions are not envisioned, but analyzing the potential reductions at each of the 30 locations will provide Army leaders flexibility in making future decisions about how and where to make cuts to reach the necessary end-strength as dictated by current fiscal, policy, and strategic conditions.

The further reduction in active component Army Soldiers to 420,000, as indicated in the 2014 QDR, is approximately double that analyzed in the 2013 PEA (142,000 compared to 72,000) assuming the same baseline. For analysis in the SPEA, the Army is doubling the maximum reduction scenarios as presented in the 2013 PEA to achieve the increase in force reductions under current fiscal, policy, and strategic conditions. For each installation with two or more BCTs in FY 2012, the SPEA assumes the loss of two BCTs (approximately 3,450 Soldiers for Infantry BCTs, 3,850 for Armored BCTs, and 4,200 for Stryker BCTs), as well as 60 percent of the installation's non-BCT Soldiers and 30 percent of the Army civilian workforce. For installations with only one BCT, the SPEA assumes a loss of one BCT and 60 percent of the installation's non-BCT Soldiers and 30 percent of the Army civilian workforce. For installations

<sup>1</sup> As noted in the SPEA, Section 1.2, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 provided some relief from sequestration cuts, but these cuts are set to resume in FY 2016 unless Congress acts to stop them.

1 **Table FNSI-1. Alternative 1—Force Reductions**

Installation Name	Fiscal Year of Baseline Population	Baseline Permanent Party Soldier and Army Civilian Population <sup>a</sup>	Potential Population Loss Analyzed in the 2013 PEA	Potential Population Loss Analyzed in SPEA <sup>b</sup>	Lowest Potential Fiscal Year 2020 Baseline Permanent Party Soldier and Army Civilian Population
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland	2013	12,335	--	4,300	8,035
Fort Belvoir, Virginia	2013	9,721	--	4,600	5,121
Fort Benning, Georgia	2011	17,501	7,100	10,800	6,701
Fort Bliss, Texas	2011	31,380	8,000	16,000	15,380
Fort Bragg, North Carolina	2011	52,975	8,000	16,000	36,975
Fort Campbell, Kentucky	2011	32,281	8,000	16,000	16,281
Fort Carson, Colorado	2011	25,702	8,000	16,000	9,702
Fort Drum, New York	2011	19,011	8,000	16,000	3,011
Fort Gordon, Georgia	2011	8,142	4,300	4,600	3,542
Fort Hood, Texas	2011	47,190	8,000	16,000	31,190
Fort Huachuca, Arizona	2013	5,841	--	2,700	3,141
Fort Irwin, California	2011	5,539	2,400	3,600	1,939
Fort Jackson, South Carolina	2013	5,735	--	3,100	2,635
Fort Knox, Kentucky	2011	13,127	3,800	7,600	5,527
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas	2013	5,004	--	2,500	2,504
Fort Lee, Virginia	2011	6,474	2,400	3,600	2,874
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri	2011	9,161	3,900	5,400	3,761
Fort Meade, Maryland	2013	6,638	--	3,500	3,138

Installation Name	Fiscal Year of Baseline Population	Baseline Permanent Party Soldier and Army Civilian Population <sup>a</sup>	Potential Population Loss Analyzed in the 2013 PEA	Potential Population Loss Analyzed in SPEA <sup>b</sup>	Lowest Potential Fiscal Year 2020 Baseline Permanent Party Soldier and Army Civilian Population
Fort Polk, Louisiana	2011	10,836	5,300	6,500	4,336
Fort Riley, Kansas	2011	19,995	8,000	16,000	3,995
Fort Rucker, Alabama	2013	4,957	--	2,500	2,457
Fort Sill, Oklahoma	2011	11,337	4,700	6,800	4,537
Fort Stewart, Georgia	2011	18,647	8,000	16,000	2,647
Fort Wainwright, Alaska	2011	7,430	4,900	5,800	1,630
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska	2011	6,861	4,300	5,300	1,561
Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia	2011	7,382	2,700	4,200	3,182
Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington	2011	36,222	8,000	16,000	20,222
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam Houston, Texas	2013	12,256	--	5,900	6,356
USAG Hawaii (Fort Shafter), Hawai'i	2013	7,431	--	3,800	3,631
USAG Hawaii (Schofield Barracks), Hawai'i	2011	18,441	8,000	16,000	2,441

1 Note: These reductions are used as the maximum potential force reduction thresholds for each installation, thereby providing force structure  
 2 decision makers with options as they consider what best serves the Nation's defense prior to determining units and locations to be  
 3 affected by reductions. As with the 2013 PEA, the total maximum potential reduction numbers presented in this table far exceed what is  
 4 needed to achieve the goals of the 2014 QDR.

5 <sup>a</sup> Populations include: Army military and Army civilians (excludes Army students and other military service personnel, contractors, and transients);  
 6 population reduction numbers include full-time military and civilian employees only. Source of data is the Army Stationing Installation Plan  
 7 (February 2012 for FY 2011 data and October 2013 for FY 2013 data). Where baseline populations differ from that in the 2013 PEA, differences  
 8 represent corrections to data (e.g., removal of student populations because they are not part of the permanent party population). The population  
 9 numbers do not include non-appropriated fund personnel.

10 <sup>b</sup> Potential population losses to be analyzed in the SPEA are inclusive of the numbers previously analyzed in the 2013 PEA.

1 with no BCTs, the SPEA assumes a loss of 70 percent of the installation's active component  
2 Soldiers and 30 percent of the Army civilian workforce. Because it is unlikely that any one  
3 installation would be selected to sustain a force reduction of more than 16,000 Soldiers and  
4 Army civilian employees, the potential reduction was capped at 16,000.

5 In addition, the Army may have to adjust force structure of the Reserve Component, and reduce  
6 Army Reserve and Army National Guard (ARNG) end-strength to complement active  
7 component force reductions. Those Reserve ARNG and changes are beyond the scope of the  
8 SPEA.

### 9 **No Action Alternative**

10 As described in the 2013 PEA, the No Action Alternative would retain the Army at a FY 2012  
11 authorized end-strength of about 562,000 active component Soldiers and more than 320,000  
12 Army civilians. The No Action Alternative generally assumes that units would remain stationed  
13 where they were stationed at the end of FY 2012. Under the No Action Alternative, no additional  
14 Army personnel would have been realigned or released from the Army to balance the  
15 composition of Army skill sets to match current and projected future mission requirements or to  
16 address budget requirements. No BCT restructuring would have occurred as proposed under  
17 Alternative 2 of the 2013 PEA, and no unit inactivations would have occurred.

18 While no longer realistic because force reductions and restructuring have occurred since FY  
19 2012, as published in the Army Stationing and Installation Plan in FY 2012, the inclusion of the  
20 No Action Alternative within the SPEA provides a baseline against which to compare the  
21 potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the Proposed Action as required by  
22 CEQ regulations.

## 23 **5.0 Summary of Environmental Effects**

24 The analysis of the potential environmental impacts is documented in the SPEA for Army 2020  
25 realignment. Tables FNSI-2 and FNSI-3 provide a summary of impacts that are anticipated to  
26 result under the No Action Alternative and those that would result from implementing  
27 Alternative 1, respectively.

### 28 **Impacts Anticipated as a Result of the Implementation of Alternative 1**

29 Alternative 1 would involve the reduction of active component Soldiers and Army civilians to  
30 achieve an active component end-strength of 420,000 Soldiers by reducing those forces at the 30  
31 locations shown in Table FNSI-1. The resource areas and impacts are:

32 **Air Quality:** There would be a beneficial impact to regional air quality from reduced stationary  
33 and mobile emission sources at all installations considered under this alternative. There would be  
34 less combustion and generation of air pollutants for which there are National Ambient Air  
35 Quality Standards (e.g., ozone, sulfur byproducts, lead) and hazardous air pollutants associated

1 with military training. Long-term effects from implementation of Alternative 1 would include a  
2 decrease in stationary source emissions, such as from boiler units and by units using  
3 transportable generators during training operations. Fewer privately owned and fleet vehicles  
4 would decrease air pollutants (e.g., carbon monoxide and ozone) because there would be less  
5 traffic on and off installations; however, for installations in more urban areas, those vehicles  
6 would likely still be traveling within the same airshed. A net reduction in greenhouse gas and  
7 fossil fuel use would occur.

8 **Airspace:** No increases in airspace designations would be required to implement Alternative 1.  
9 Some beneficial impacts to the National Airspace System may occur because reduced use of  
10 airspace would occur, requiring less frequent activation of Special Use Airspace to support  
11 training activities.

12 **Cultural Resources:** Alternative 1 would result in a reduction of training activities at  
13 installations, which would reduce the risk of impacts on cultural resources. Installations would  
14 continue to manage cultural resources in accordance with Integrated Cultural Resource  
15 Management Plans to ensure that demolition, maintenance, and routine actions and training  
16 activities do not cause a significant impact to cultural resources. Before any action with the  
17 potential to affect an eligible or potentially eligible resource, the State Historic Preservation  
18 Officer would be consulted under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as  
19 required, or under existing agreements.

20 Under Alternative 1, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, identified the potential for significant but  
21 mitigable impacts to cultural resources, namely to the installation's Historic District. The effects  
22 of this alternative are similar to those analyzed in the No Action Alternative—the reduction of  
23 forces at Fort Wainwright would not result in a change to the existing conditions. Therefore, if  
24 current operations are having a significant but mitigable impact on cultural resources, the  
25 potential reduction in troops proposed in Alternative 1 would not alter those impacts. Joint Base  
26 Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska, and U.S. Army Garrison (USAG) Hawaii (including both Fort  
27 Shafter and Schofield Barracks) also may experience significant but mitigable cultural resource  
28 impacts as part of the implementation of Alternative 1. As noted above, the reduction of forces  
29 would not alter the existing conditions at these installations, which are analyzed in the No  
30 Action Alternative.

31 **Noise:** There would be a beneficial impact from a reduced frequency of training. Fewer weapons  
32 firing and less training, and maneuver activity would generally reduce nuisance noise impacts,  
33 resulting in beneficial impacts to overall noise levels. Some installations would continue to  
34 experience adverse, though reduced, noise impacts from ongoing mission activities.

35 **Soils:** There would be a beneficial impact from reduced frequency of training. Less firing and  
36 maneuver activity would reduce soil disturbances for a beneficial impact.

1 **Biological Resources:** There could be some beneficial, long-term impacts to biological  
2 resources (e.g., vegetation and wildlife) from a reduced frequency of training. In this case, less  
3 firing and maneuver activities would reduce biological resource impacts. There would be no  
4 significant impacts to threatened and endangered species anticipated because installations would  
5 continue to be able to implement conservation plans and measures in support of listed species.

6 **Wetlands:** Beneficial to minor impacts to wetlands are anticipated because of a reduced  
7 frequency of training.

8 **Water Resources:** Negligible to minor impacts to surface water and groundwater are anticipated  
9 at all installations due to reduced sedimentation, disturbance, or spills from training and testing  
10 activities. Application of best management practices would ensure that pollutants are properly  
11 handled and disposed of, and that any hazardous waste does not enter ground or surface waters.  
12 Water demand and treatment requirements would decrease for a beneficial impact at  
13 most installations.

14 **Facilities:** Overall, minor, adverse impacts to facilities are anticipated at all installations.  
15 Personnel reductions associated with Alternative 1 would reduce requirements for facilities and  
16 affect space utilization across all installations. Depending on the missions associated with the  
17 population reductions at a given installation, the facility effects would either create additional  
18 excess capacity or shrink existing capacity shortfalls. Occupants of older, underutilized, or  
19 excess facilities may be moved to newer facilities; in some cases this could require modification  
20 of existing facilities. Construction projects that had been programmed in the future may not  
21 occur or could be downscoped. Force reductions would reduce the Army's demand for utilities  
22 and housing units; therefore, the government could incur costs for not meeting any guaranteed  
23 minimum quantities required by existing privatization agreements. While excess facility capacity  
24 would be created in the aggregate across the Army's installations, as noted in Section 1.3 of the  
25 SPEA, reductions that could result in underutilization of training areas and facilities to the point  
26 that these training areas and facilities would become excess is not reasonably foreseeable at  
27 this time for purposes of NEPA.

28 **Socioeconomics:** The level of significance was determined by the Economic Impact Forecasting  
29 System (EIFS) model, which produces thresholds for assessing the significance of impacts based  
30 on deviations relative to historical averages. The EIFS model evaluates changes in sales, income,  
31 employment, and population. A summary of these potential impacts is provided in Table FNSI-4.  
32 If EIFS predicted one or more of these indicators as significant, the overall rating for  
33 socioeconomics was determined to be significant (Table FNSI-3).

34 There could be significant, adverse impacts to the regional economies of a number of  
35 installations. Significant, adverse regional economic impacts from force reduction, in terms of  
36 sales, employment, regional population, and/or income are anticipated at Aberdeen Proving  
37 Ground, Maryland; Fort Benning, Georgia; Fort Bliss, Texas; Fort Bragg, North Carolina; Fort

1 Carson, Colorado; Fort Campbell, Kentucky/Tennessee; Fort Drum, New York; Fort Gordon,  
2 Georgia; Fort Hood, Texas; Fort Huachuca, Arizona; Fort Jackson, South Carolina; Fort Knox,  
3 Kentucky; Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; Fort Lee, Virginia; Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Fort  
4 Polk, Louisiana; Fort Riley, Kansas; Fort Rucker, Alabama; Fort Sill, Oklahoma; Fort Stewart,  
5 Georgia; Fort Wainwright, Alaska; Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska; Joint Base  
6 Langley-Eustis, Virginia; Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington; and USAG Hawaii, Hawai'i.  
7 Less than significant economic impacts would occur in areas with more diversified economies at  
8 Fort Belvoir, Virginia; Fort Irwin, California; Fort Meade, Maryland; and Joint Base San  
9 Antonio-Fort Sam Houston, Texas.

10 Socioeconomic impacts could include greater impacts to lower income populations that provide  
11 services to military employees and installations, or where job losses affect communities whose  
12 proportion of minority population is higher than the state average. Some school districts may  
13 need to re-evaluate staffing plans for schools that could lose Soldiers and Army civilian-related  
14 students as part of their student populations.

15 **Energy Demand and Generation:** Beneficial impacts are anticipated at all installations because  
16 installation and regional energy demands would decrease.

17 **Land Use Conflict and Compatibility:** Beneficial impacts could occur as a result of reduced  
18 training activities and an associated decrease in the use of land for training. Depending on the  
19 installation, this could reduce adverse impacts associated with incompatible uses with areas  
20 surrounding the installation, reduce the impacts of installation noise on surrounding land uses, or  
21 allow for more use of installation land for recreational activities in lieu of training activities.

22 **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste:** Negligible to less than significant impacts would  
23 result. Remediation activities are not expected to be affected by the reduced numbers of Soldiers  
24 and support personnel. It is expected that the potential for spills would be reduced during training  
25 and maintenance activities. Waste collection, storage, and disposal processes would remain  
26 mostly unchanged, although the quantities are expected to be reduced. Violations of hazardous  
27 waste regulations or hazardous waste permits are not anticipated to increase as a result of  
28 force reductions.

29 **Traffic and Transportation:** Beneficial impacts are anticipated as traffic decreases on and off  
30 the installations. Delays at access points would decrease at some installations during morning  
31 and evening peak traffic hours. At certain installations such as Fort Belvoir, Fort Bragg, Joint  
32 Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, and USAG Hawaii, traffic back-ups  
33 from main gate access points to federal and state highways may be reduced during peak  
34 traffic hours.

1

This page intentionally left blank.

1 **Table FNSI-2. Potential Environmental Impacts of the No Action Alternative**

Valued Environmental Component	Resource Area													
	Air Quality	Airspace	Cultural Resources	Noise	Soils	Biological Resources	Wetlands	Water Resources	Facilities	Socio-economics	Energy Demand and Generation	Land Use Conflicts and Compatibility	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste	Traffic and Transportation
Aberdeen Proving Ground	M	N	M	M	M	M	M	M	N	B	M	M	M	M
Fort Belvoir	M	N	N	N	M	N	N	M	N	B	M	M	M	LS
Fort Benning	M	M	M	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	M	B	M	LS	M	M
Fort Bliss	M	M	N	N	M	N	N	M	N	B	N	M	M	SM
Fort Bragg	M	M	N	M	SM	N	M	N	N	B	M	N	N	SM
Fort Campbell	M	N	N	N	M	N	N	M	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Carson	LS	N	N	N	LS	N	M	M	M	B	N	N	M	LS
Fort Drum	M	N	M	N	N	M	M	N	N	B	M	N	N	M
Fort Gordon	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	LS	B	N	SM	N	N
Fort Hood	M	N	N	N	M	M	N	M	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Huachuca	M	N	M	M	M	M	M	M	N	B	M	M	M	N
Fort Irwin	M	N	M	N	M	M	N	LS	M	B	N	M	M	M
Fort Jackson	M	N	N	N	M	M	M	M	N	B	M	M	M	N
Fort Knox	M	N	N	N	M	N	N	M	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Leavenworth	M	N	M	N	M	M	N	M	N	B	M	N	M	M
Fort Lee	M	N	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Leonard Wood	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Meade	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	B	M	N	M	M
Fort Polk	N	N	N	N	M	N	N	N	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Riley	M	N	N	N	M	N	N	M	N	B	N	N	N	N
Fort Rucker	M	N	N	LS	M	N	M	M	N	B	M	LS	M	LS
Fort Sill	M	N	N	SM	N	N	N	N	N	B	N	N	N	M
Fort Stewart	M	N	N	N	M	N	M	M	N	B	N	N	N	M
Fort Wainwright	M	M	SM	M	M	M	M	M	N	B	N	N	N	M
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	LS	N	SM	M	LS	SM	LS	M	M	B	M	M	LS	LS
Joint Base Langley-Eustis	M	N	M	N	N	M	M	N	M	B	M	N	M	LS
Joint Base Lewis-McChord	LS	S	LS	S	N	LS	N	LS	LS	B	N	M	M	S
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam Houston	M	N	M	N	M	N	M	M	N	B	M	N	M	N
USAG Hawaii—Schofield Barracks and Fort Shafter	N-M	M	M-SM	LS-SM	N-SM	N-SM	M	M	N-M	B	N	N	M	N

2 Notes: B – beneficial, N – negligible/no impact, M – minor, LS – less than significant, SM – significant but mitigable, S – significant

1 **Table FNSI-3. Potential Environmental Impacts of Alternative 1—Implement Force Reductions**

Valued Environmental Component	Resource Area													
	Air Quality	Airspace	Cultural Resources	Noise	Soils	Biological Resources	Wetlands	Water Resources	Facilities	Socio-economics	Energy Demand and Generation	Land Use Conflicts and Compatibility	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste	Traffic and Transportation
Aberdeen Proving Ground	B	N	M	M	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	M	M	B
Fort Belvoir	B	B	M	N	B	B	B	B	M	LS	B	N	M	B
Fort Benning	B	N	M	M	B	B	N	M	M	S	B	M	B	B
Fort Bliss	B	M	M	B	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	M	M	B
Fort Bragg	B	M	M	B	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	N	M	B
Fort Campbell	B	N	N	B	B	N	N	B	M	S	B	N	N	B
Fort Carson	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	N	B	B
Fort Drum	B	N	M	N	B	M	B	N	M	S	B	N	N	B
Fort Gordon	B	N	N	B	N	N	N	N	M	S	B	B	N	B
Fort Hood	B	B	M	B	B	B	N	B	M	S	B	N	N	B
Fort Huachuca	B	B	M	B	B	B	B	M	M	S	B	M	M	B
Fort Irwin	B	B	B	B	B	B	N	B	M	LS	B	M	M	M
Fort Jackson	B	B	N	B	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	B	M	B
Fort Knox	B	N	M	B	B	N	N	B	M	S	B	N	M	B
Fort Leavenworth	B	N	M	B	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	N	M	B
Fort Lee	B	N	M	B	N	N	N	N	M	S	B	B	M	B
Fort Leonard Wood	B	N	M	N	N	N	N	N	M	S	B	N	M	B
Fort Meade	B	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	M	LS	B	N	M	B
Fort Polk	B	N	N	N	N	N	B	B	M	S	B	N	M	B
Fort Riley	B	N	M	B	N	B	N	B	M	S	B	N	M	B
Fort Rucker	B	N	N	B	B	B	B	B	M	S	B	B	M	B
Fort Sill	B	N	M	B	N	N	N	B	M	S	B	B	LS	B
Fort Stewart	B	N	M	B	N	B	B	B	M	S	B	B	M	B
Fort Wainwright	B	B	SM	B	N	M	M	M	M	S	B	B	N	B
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	B	B	SM	B	M	M	B	B	M	S	B	M	LS	B
Joint Base Langley-Eustis	B	N	M	B	B	M	B	N	M	S	B	N	M	B
Joint Base Lewis-McChord	B	N	M	B	N	B	N	B	M	S	B	B	LS	B
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam Houston	B	N	M	B	B	B	B	B	M	LS	B	N	M	B
USAG Hawaii—Schofield Barracks and Fort Shafter	B	B	M-SM	B	B	B	M-B	M-B	M	S	B	B	M	B

2 Notes: B – beneficial, N – negligible/no impact, M – minor, LS – less than significant, SM – significant but mitigable, S – significant

1 **Table FNSI-4. Potential Socioeconomic Impacts of Alternative 1—Implement Force**  
 2 **Reductions**

Installation	Sales	Income	Employment	Population
Aberdeen Proving Ground	LS	LS	LS	S
Fort Belvoir	LS	LS	LS	LS
Fort Benning	LS	LS	LS	S
Fort Bliss	LS	LS	S	S
Fort Bragg	LS	LS	S	S
Fort Campbell	LS	LS	S	S
Fort Carson	LS	LS	S	S
Fort Drum	S	S	S	S
Fort Gordon	LS	LS	LS	S
Fort Hood	LS	LS	S	S
Fort Huachuca	LS	LS	S	S
Fort Irwin	LS	LS	LS	LS
Fort Jackson	LS	LS	LS	S
Fort Knox	LS	S	S	S
Fort Leavenworth	S	S	S	S
Fort Lee	LS	LS	LS	S
Fort Leonard Wood	LS	S	S	S
Fort Meade	LS	LS	LS	LS
Fort Polk	LS	S	S	S
Fort Riley	S	S	S	S
Fort Rucker	LS	LS	LS	S
Fort Sill	S	S	S	S
Fort Stewart	S	S	S	S
Fort Wainwright	LS	LS	S	S
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	LS	LS	S	S
Joint Base Langley-Eustis	LS	LS	S	S
Joint Base Lewis-McChord	LS	LS	LS	S
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam Houston	LS	LS	LS	LS
USAG Hawaii—Schofield Barracks and Fort Shafter	LS	LS	S	S

3 Notes: LS – less than significant, S – significant

## 1 **6.0 Conclusion**

2 Based on a careful review of the SPEA, which is incorporated by reference, I have concluded  
3 that no significant environmental impacts, other than socioeconomic impacts, are likely to result  
4 from the implementation of the Proposed Action under the alternative analyzed. Therefore, an  
5 environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be required. Environmental impacts associated  
6 with the implementation of the Proposed Action could occur to air quality, airspace, cultural  
7 resources, noise, soils, biological resources, wetlands, water resources, facilities,  
8 socioeconomics, energy demand, land use, hazardous materials and waste, and traffic and  
9 transportation. The Army is committed to implementing required environmental compliance and  
10 meeting health and safety requirements despite reduced funding. The continued adherence to  
11 standard operating procedures, best management practices, and various existing installation  
12 management plans (e.g., Integrated Training Area Management Program, Integrated Natural  
13 Resources Management Plan, and Endangered Species Management Plan) would ensure no  
14 significant impacts under the Proposed Action. The Army is committed to monitoring the  
15 impacts of reductions on its environmental programs and will make staffing adjustments as  
16 necessary to ensure that these cuts do not significantly adversely affect Army programs.  
17 Significant but mitigable impacts could occur under the Proposed Action to cultural resources,  
18 but measures to reduce impacts to less than significant are currently in place and would continue  
19 under the Proposed Action. After further force structure decisions are made, it is possible that  
20 additional site-specific NEPA analyses would be conducted, as appropriate, to implement  
21 these decisions.

22 The SPEA has identified that socioeconomic impacts could be significant at many installations.  
23 These impacts are of particular concern to the Army. CEQ and Army regulations state that  
24 economic or social impacts are not intended by themselves to require preparation of an EIS.  
25 Therefore, in accordance with these federal regulations, the Army is not preparing an EIS. Even  
26 though an EIS will not be prepared, the SPEA contains a comprehensive analysis of the  
27 socioeconomic impacts, which will be carefully considered before any force structure decisions  
28 are made.

29 The Army has not completed its planning for unit realignment and inactivations. The information  
30 in the SPEA will be used to support a series of decisions in the coming years regarding how the  
31 force is to be realigned. Those decisions will be made based on mission-related criteria and other  
32 factors, in addition to potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts identified in the SPEA  
33 and any future environmental analysis needed to support Army realignment decisions.

1 This is a Draft FNSI and is available for public comment for 60 days following the publication of  
2 the Notice of Availability of the SPEA and Draft FNSI in the *Federal Register*. Written  
3 comments on the SPEA and Draft FNSI should be sent to: U.S. Army Environmental Command,  
4 ATTN: SPEA Public Comments, 2450 Connell Road (Building 2264), Joint Base San Antonio-  
5 Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7664 or emailed to [usarmy.jbsa.aec.nepa@mail.mil](mailto:usarmy.jbsa.aec.nepa@mail.mil). Inquiries may  
6 also be made via phone by calling 210-466-1590 or toll-free 855-846-3940.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 James L. Huggins, Jr.  
15 Lieutenant General, U.S. Army  
16 Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

17

18