

specific NEPA analysis may be required at some installations, depending on the size of the force realignment.

DATES: Submit comments on or before February 19, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Public Comments USAEC, Attention: IMPA-AE (Army 2020 PEA), 2450 Connell Road (Bldg 2264), Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234-7664; or by email to USARMY.JBSA.AEC.MBX@mail.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: (210) 466-1590 or email: USARMY.JBSA.AEC.MBX@mail.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Implementation of Army force realignment will occur over the course of several years to arrive by 2020 at an optimally configured force, reduced from an FY 2012 authorized end strength of 562,000 to 490,000. Reductions in Army Soldiers will also be accompanied by some reduction in civil service employees. These actions are being undertaken to reshape the Army's forces to meet more effectively national security requirements while reducing the Army's end-strength. Force realignment and some level of force reduction will impact most major Army installations. The implementation of this force rebalancing is necessary to allow the Army to operate in a reduced budget climate, while ensuring the Army can continue to support the nation's critical defense missions.

The PEA, upon which the draft FNSI is based, evaluates the largest potential force reduction scenarios, as well as growth scenarios from BCT restructuring, that could occur at select installations as a result of Army force restructuring. This range of potential installation reduction and growth (ranging from maximum losses of 8,000 military personnel to maximum increases of 3,000 at the Army's largest installations) was chosen for the environmental analysis to provide flexibility as future force structure realignment decisions are made; the specific locations where changes will occur have not been decided.

The PEA provides information to decision makers concerning potential environmental impacts, to include socioeconomic impacts, associated with stationing actions as these decisions are made in the coming years. The PEA analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts that may occur at 21 installations. These stationing sites were included in the PEA as they are sites that could experience a change in Soldiers and civilians that exceeds a total of 1,000

military personnel. The PEA analyzes the environmental impact of two Action alternatives to implement force reduction and realignment: Alternative 1: Implement Army force reductions and restructuring of BCTs, combat support units, and civilian support between FY 2013 and FY 2020; and Alternative 2: Implement Alternative 1, inactivate additional BCTs and also restructure remaining BCTs by adding an additional combat maneuver battalion and/or an engineer battalion. Force reductions that may occur as part of the proposed action include the inactivation of BCTs and combat support and combat service support units at Army and joint base installations. This reduction would include the inactivation of at least eight BCTs. In addition to these alternatives, the Army also evaluated a No Action alternative. The No Action alternative continues current force structure, and retains the active Army at the FY 2012 authorized end strength of 562,000. The No Action alternative allows for a comparison of baseline conditions with the environmental impacts of each of the two Action alternatives.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the two Action alternatives include impacts to air quality; airspace; cultural and biological resources; noise; soil erosion; wetlands; water resources; facilities; socioeconomic; energy demand; land use; hazardous materials and waste; and traffic and transportation. No significant environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of implementing either alternative associated with the proposed action, with the exception of socioeconomic impacts. Socioeconomic impacts are of particular concern to the Army because they affect communities around Army installations. Therefore, the PEA has a comprehensive analysis of the socioeconomic impacts to inform the decision makers and communities. Impacts could include reduced employment, income, regional population, and sales, and some of these impacts could be significant. An EIS is not required, however, when the only significant impacts are socioeconomic.

The draft FNSI finds that there are no significant environmental impacts with either Action alternative. Final decisions as to which alternative will be implemented or which installations will see reductions or unit realignments have not been made. Those decisions will be made based on mission-related criteria and other factors in light of the information contained in the PEA.

An electronic version of the PEA and draft FNSI is available for download at:

<http://aec.army.mil/usaec/nepa/topics00.html>.

Brenda S. Bowen,
Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 2013-01003 Filed 1-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Training Mission and Mission Support Activities at Fort Campbell, KY

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.
ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to evaluate the impacts of current and future training and mission-related activities at Fort Campbell, Kentucky (portions of Fort Campbell are also located in Tennessee). The PEIS is being completed to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the environmental impacts of proposed alternatives for implementing the training and mission support activities at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. The PEIS will assess range construction, associated training and land management activities, and adjustments to military airspace to support Fort Campbell's training requirements. This PEIS analyzes portions of the Range Complex Master Plan which has been developed to address training and training facility requirements over the next 10 years.

ADDRESSES: Please send written comments to Mr. Gene Zirkle, NEPA/Wildlife Program Manager, Environmental Division, Building 2159 13th Street, Fort Campbell, KY 42223; or by email to gene.a.zirkle.civ@mail.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Gene Zirkle at (270) 798-9854, during normal working business hours Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. C.S.T.; or by email to gene.a.zirkle.civ@mail.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Campbell must provide modernized live-fire ranges, quality maneuver training areas, the airspace necessary for the training of Army aviation units and unmanned aerial systems (UAS), and modern training facilities. The requirement to provide quality training support to Soldiers and units will continue into the future as mission requirements, military preparedness,

and Soldier/unit training requirements change. Fort Campbell must be prepared to meet future training requirements by providing modern training facilities and ranges.

As technology changes, new weapons, weapons systems, and unmanned systems are incorporated into tactical units. These technological advances dictate changes to how the Army trains, the space needed for maneuver training to include airspace, and new ranges to accommodate the live-fire training on new weapon systems. In addition, the installation must support training of other military services as well as training of various federal organizations.

Fort Campbell's ranges and training lands require routine maintenance, modernization, and in some cases construction of new facilities to continue to provide Soldiers with a high quality training environment. These types of activities will continue into the future as mission requirements, military preparedness, and Soldier training requirements change.

A range of reasonable alternatives will be analyzed in the PEIS. Five alternatives have been identified to meet the requirements of the proposed action. Alternative 1 would provide for site-specific range construction projects needed to support the live-fire training on the installation. Alternative 2 would create adaptable use zones (AUZ) to facilitate future range modernization and construction. Alternative 3 would implement routine range and training land actions to maintain and sustain the installation range and training land complex in an environmentally sound manner. This includes the formalization of environmental stewardship best management practices (BMPs). Alternative 4 would restructure and expand the current controlled airspace to accommodate the Army aviation units, UAS, and joint training with the U.S. Air Force. Alternative 5 would implement the above 4 alternatives as one consolidated alternative.

The PEIS will also consider a No Action alternative. Under the No Action alternative, none of the action alternatives would be implemented. Range use and training land management would continue under the status quo. Other reasonable alternatives identified during the scoping process will be considered for evaluation in the PEIS.

The proposed action would allow future development of Fort Campbell's training infrastructure that could have significant impacts to airspace, natural and cultural resources, water resources, and other environmental resources.

Mitigation measures will also be identified for adverse impacts.

Scoping and public comments: Federally recognized Indian Tribes, federal, state, and local agencies, organizations, and the public are invited to be involved in the scoping process for the preparation of this PEIS by participating in meetings and/or submitting written comments. The scoping process will help identify possible alternatives, potential environmental impacts, and key issues of concern to be analyzed in the PEIS. Written comments will be accepted within 30 days of publication of the Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register**. Public meetings will be held in Clarksville, Tennessee and Hopkinsville, Kentucky. Notification of the times and locations for the scoping meetings will be published locally.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013-01002 Filed 1-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Missouri River Recovery Management Plan, Missouri River, United States

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Kansas City and Omaha Districts, intend to prepare the Missouri River Recovery Management Plan (Plan) with integrated Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information and/or questions about the proposed Plan, please contact Ms. Lisa Rabbe, Project Manager, by telephone: (816) 389-3837, by mail: 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106, or by email:

Lisa.A.Rabbe@usace.army.mil, or Mr.

Randy Sellers, Project Manager, by telephone: (402) 995-2689, by mail: 1616 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, NE 68102-4901, or by email:

Randy.P.Sellers@usace.army.mil

mailto:Gwyn.M.Jarrett@usace.army.mil.

For inquiries from the media, please contact the USACE Kansas City District Public Affairs Officer (PAO), Mr. David Kolarik by telephone: (816) 389-3486,

by mail: 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106, or by email:

David.S.Kolarik@usace.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Through preparation of the Plan and EIS, USACE will develop a range of alternatives for the purposes of Missouri River recovery and mitigation. This federal action includes activities on the Missouri River and is designed to assist in the recovery of Missouri River species protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Mitigation actions address USACE's requirements pursuant to the 1958 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (Pub. L. 85-624), section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986, and section 334(a) and (b) of the WRDA of 1999, and Section 3176 of the WRDA 2007.

Section 3176 of WRDA 2007 expanded the USACE's authority to include recovery and mitigation activities on the Missouri River in the upper basin states of Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The combination of recovery and mitigation activities is commonly referred to as the Missouri River Recovery Program.

In accordance with 40 CFR 1502.4 (c), this EIS will evaluate all proposals or parts of proposals similar in nature such that, in effect, they represent a single course of action. The Missouri River Recovery Management Plan EIS will assess and, where appropriate, supplement or update prior analysis made pursuant to the requirements listed above. The EIS will assess the cumulative effects and alternatives to accomplish the purposes of the ESA, the 1958 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (Pub. L. 85-624), section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986, and section 334(a) and (b) of the WRDA of 1999, and Section 3176 of the WRDA 2007. The federal actions which implement those authorities have been combined into one program and are being assessed together to effectively and efficiently carry out the multiple goals associated with the authorizations. Additionally to be addressed in this EIS, the USACE has received a proposal from the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee, recommending the agency perform an effects analysis and adaptive management of potential management actions on ESA listed species. Addressing this proposal will result in an analysis of management alternatives and adaptive management actions to benefit these species, and thus requires supporting environmental effects analyses which will be included in this Environmental Impact Statement.