



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, SAVANNAH DISTRICT  
100 W. OGLETHORPE AVENUE  
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31401-3604

June 18, 2021

Planning Branch

**PUBLIC NOTICE**  
**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District**

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:**

**SUBJECT:** Notice of Availability of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA), and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Fort Jackson 2020 Real Property Master Plan (RPMP).

Notice of the following is hereby given:

- a. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, notice is hereby given that the Savannah District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) has prepared a Draft PEA and FONSI for the Fort Jackson 2020 RPMP.
- b. Savannah District announces the availability to the public of the Draft PEA and Draft FONSI for the Fort Jackson 2020 RPMP. Downloaded document copies may be obtained from the District website at:  
<http://www.sas.usace.army.mil/About/Divisions-and-Offices/Planning-Division/Plans-and-Reports/>.
- c. Written statements regarding the Draft PEA and FONSI for the proposed action will be received at the Savannah District Office until

**12 O'CLOCK NOON, 20 Jul 2021**

from those interested in the activity and whose interests may be affected by the proposed action.

**LOCATION OF PROPOSED ACTION:** Fort Jackson is centrally located in Richland County, SC and is located within the city limits of Columbia approximately five miles east of the business district (Figure 2.1). Charleston is located approximately 110 miles southeast, and Greenville is located approximately 105 miles northwest. Shaw Air Force Base is located approximately 35 miles east; Charlotte, NC, is located approximately 90 miles north; and Augusta, GA, is located approximately 75 miles to the southwest.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This PEA evaluates a multi-faceted Proposed Action that includes implementation of the 2020 Fort Jackson RPMP and its three area

development plans (ADPs): 1. Victory District ADP; 2. Semmes District ADP; and 3. Palmetto and Villages Districts ADP.

The PEA describes and provides a programmatic evaluation of Ongoing and New Mission Activities. However, it does not cover ranges and training lands, because these items are not addressed in the RPMP. Figures 2.1 and 2.2 show maps of Fort Jackson and the Installation Framework Plan, respectively.

The Proposed Action also includes the implementation of the Fort Jackson component plans: Installation Planning Standards and Real Property Vision Plan. The RPMP process is based on guidance provided in AR 210-20, *Real Property Master Planning for Army Installations*, which assigns responsibilities and prescribes policies and procedures relating to the development, content, submission, and maintenance of a RPMP. This process provides direction for future development, operation, management, and maintenance of resources in a framework sustaining compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Alternative plans were developed as part of the planning process. The alternatives that were considered were as follows:

a. **Alternative 1 - No Action Alternative:** Under the No Action Alternative (NAA), Fort Jackson would continue to utilize and develop land in accordance with the 2012 RPMP. Maintenance, repair, and operation of existing operational and support facilities would continue as currently conducted. The Installation could not accept any new missions requiring substantial renovation or demolition of existing buildings or supporting infrastructure or new construction.

b. **Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative – Implement the proposed 2020 Real Property Master Plan (RPMP):** This alternative consists of Fort Jackson implementing the proposed 2020 RPMP and all its component plans: Installation Planning Standards, Real Property Vision Plan, Palmetto and Villages Districts ADP, Semmes District ADP, and Victory District ADP. The proposed projects would be completed, along with any associated demolition, as required to support all elements of the RPMP and associated current and future mission requirements. Fort Jackson could accept any new missions that would require substantial renovation of, or additions to, the existing building stock or supporting infrastructure. The Installation would be able to modify land use to accommodate changes in on-going and future missions.

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY EVALUATION:**

**Environmental Assessment:** Savannah District has prepared a Draft PEA and found that an Environmental Impact Statement would not be required for this action. The Draft PEA is being coordinated concurrently with this Notice to Federal and State natural resource agencies for review and comment.

**Air Quality.** Implementation of the preferred alternative would result in a short-term emissions increase from the operation of construction equipment, land clearing, paving off-gases, or dust. These impacts would end upon project completion. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented to reduce air quality impacts.

**Biological Resources.** Biological resources may be impacted by construction and demolition activities under the preferred alternative. The impacts of each project on wetlands and associated wildlife would be independently evaluated in a Record of Environmental Consideration (REC), as detailed siting and design are being developed. Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be completed if a project impacted a threatened or endangered species. BMPs and mitigation actions required for permitting would be implemented. All projects would be implemented in compliance with the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP).

**Cultural Resources.** Implementation of the preferred alternative would not result in impacts to cultural resources. Fort Jackson would continue to comply with the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) and Programmatic Agreement, and would continue to consult, as needed, for any effects of projects under this alternative.

**Environmental Restoration and Compliance.** Implementation of the preferred alternative may have minor, short-term adverse effects during the management and disposal of asbestos containing materials and/or lead based paint. However, long-term environmental and restoration compliance concerns would be eliminated. All hazardous materials and waste associated with renovation, demolition, and construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with Federal, state, and local regulations and would not have any significant impacts on the human and natural environment. The impacts of each project on potential IRP sites would be independently evaluated in a REC.

**Infrastructure.** The proposed projects under the preferred alternative would result in long-term beneficial impacts to the existing infrastructure and provide expanded services to meet the increased needs. There would be no significant impacts to on-Post infrastructure.

**Geology and Soils.** Construction and demolition activities would have direct, short-term adverse impacts on soils. Erosion and sediment control measures and BMPs would be implemented to minimize these impacts. These impacts would end upon project completion.

**Land Use.** Implementation of the preferred alternative would not have any significant or negative impacts to land use.

**Noise.** No long-term noise increases would occur from construction or demolition activities under the preferred alternative. BMPs would be implemented to reduce noise during construction/demolition. These impacts would end upon project completion.

**Socioeconomic Resources.** Short-term beneficial impacts on the local economy would result from the hiring of local construction companies for project under the preferred alternative. The construction of new facilities would result in long-term beneficial impacts by reducing maintenance requirements and providing more energy-efficient facilities. There are no adverse impacts to environmental justice and the protection of children.

**Transportation Systems.** Construction and demolition activities would have short-term impacts on traffic within the cantonment area, but these impacts would end upon project completion. There would be long-term beneficial impacts from projects, including improvements to vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

**Visual Resources.** Short-term minor and localized adverse impacts would result from demolition and construction activities and associated equipment. Long-term beneficial impacts would result from the improvement in the aesthetic appeal of facilities.

**Water Resources.** Long-term adverse impacts on water resources could occur during construction and demolition activities due to the potential increase in impervious surface area, which may contribute to increased erosion, stormwater runoff, pollutants, and sediment loads. Impacts would be minimized by adherence to sediment and erosion control plans, stormwater pollution prevention plans, and other BMPs.

**Cumulative Effects.** No significant adverse cumulative effects are expected as a result of implementing the preferred alternative. Present and reasonably foreseeable future actions on Fort Jackson largely involve temporary, construction-related impacts. No present or reasonably foreseeable future projects are located in areas with rare plant communities or are expected to result in the loss of any endangered or threatened species or their habitat. Therefore, any impacts associated with the preferred alternative, when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, are collectively less than significant.

**Consideration of Public Comments:** The Corps is soliciting comments from the public; Federal, State, and local agencies and officials; Native American Tribes; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of the proposed activity. Any comments received would be used in the preparation of the Final PEA and FONSI pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.

**Comment Period:** Comments on the draft PEA and FONSI should be submitted no later than the end of the comment period shown in this notice, in writing, to Sarah Smith, Directorate of Public Works-Environmental Division, 2563 Essayons Way, Fort Jackson, SC 29207 or by e-mailing the comments to the following address: [CESAS-Planning@usace.army.mil](mailto:CESAS-Planning@usace.army.mil).