


MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

[The main body of the page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document.]

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER IWR Project Report 86-PR-4 | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A174633 | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Ft. McClellan ICUZ Program - In-Progress Review | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED | |
| | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER 86-PR-4 | |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) John Singley | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) | |
| | 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Institute for Water Resources Casey Bldg., Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5586 | |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command Fort McClellan | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS | |
| | 12. REPORT DATE November 1986 | |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 89 | |
| | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified | |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Unlimited | | |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) | | |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Noise Impacts, Land Use Planning Installation Complete Use Zone. | | |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) In April 1986 an in-progress review of the (ICUZ) Study at Fort McClellan was undertaken. Members of the ICUZ Committee were interviewed, the study files and records of the Environmental Management Office were examined, and reports relevant to this program were reviewed. The Fort McClellan ICUZ Study was stalled at an early step in the prescribed process at the time of this in-progress review. Noise contours had been developed, but the installation was not able to proceed, as it was unable to gain the cooperation of the surrounding | | |

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

communities. As a result of this in-progress review, plans and arrangements are being made to provide Fort McClellan with assistance in getting its ICUZ study back on track and up to speed, so that it may accomplish the tasks that lie ahead and meet its goals and objectives without any further delay.

Approved Land Use Planning

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Ft. McClellan IOUZ Program

In-Progress Review

Prepared for

U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

Prepared by

Institute for Water Resources
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers



| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accession For | |
| NTIS GRA&I | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| DTIC TAB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unannounced | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Justification | |
| By _____ | |
| Distribution/ _____ | |
| Availability Codes | |
| Dist | Avail and/or Special |
| A-1 | |

November 1986

IWR Project Report 86-PR-4

CONTENTS

| | <u>PAGES</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 1.1 BACKGROUND | 4 |
| 1.2 PURPOSE | 4 |
| 1.3 METHODS | |
| 2.0 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM SETTING AND ACTIVITIES | 7 |
| 2.1 PROGRAM SETTING | 7 |
| 2.2 ICUZ ACTIVITIES | 11 |
| 3.0 DISCUSSION: THE PROGRAM AND ITS PROGRESS | 13 |
| 3.1 PROGRAM STATUS | 13 |
| 3.2 NOISE STUDIES | 15 |
| 3.3 STUDY TEAM | 22 |
| 3.4 LOCAL VIEWS | 28 |
| 4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS | 35 |
| 4.1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS | 35 |
| 4.2 SOME LESSONS LEARNED | 40 |
| REFERENCES | 45 |
| APPENDICIES: | |
| A. ICUZ Studies and Community Involvement | 47 |
| B. Fort McClellan's Community Involvement Plan | 65 |
| C. Letter Informing Communities of ICUZ Program | 73 |
| D. Summary Plan of Action for Fort McClellan | 77 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An in-progress review of the ICUZ study at Fort McClellan was undertaken in April 1986. Members of the ICUZ committee were interviewed, the study files and records of the Environmental Management Office were examined, and reports relevant to this program were reviewed.

The Fort McClellan ICUZ study was stalled at an early step in the prescribed process at the time of this in-progress review. Noise contours had been developed, but the installation was not able to proceed, as it was unable to gain the cooperation of the surrounding communities.

The installation mailed information and a request for help to potentially interested parties in January 1985, but responses were never received. Not until the spring of 1986 were there renewed efforts to involve any of the parties. Unfortunately these more recent efforts had not succeeded as of April 1986.

This lack of progress is attributable to events and conditions at the installation and in the communities. The installation has not had a sustained level of commitment sufficient to overcome competing time demands and other obstacles in the way of accomplishing the tasks of the ICUZ study.

The communities apparently perceive no present noise problems and are reluctant to get involved in a collaborative planning process with the

installation. This is conjecture, however, since the installation has not established communication lines required to accurately assess the situation.

As a result of this in-progress review, plans and arrangements are being made to provide Fort McClellan with assistance in getting its ICUZ study back on track and up to speed, so that it may accomplish the tasks that lie ahead and meet its goals and objectives without any further delay.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

In the interest of fulfilling its basic obligations under the Noise Control Act of 1972, the Army is presently implementing the Installation Compatible Use Zone (ICUZ) Program. ICUZ is a process intended to identify and mitigate noise impacts and problems on installations and in surrounding communities (16).

With the assistance of the Institute for Water Resources, Army Corps of Engineers, the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) developed a community involvement component for the ICUZ study process (17). TRADOC recognized that the ICUZ objectives could best be achieved through a process of community involvement. (For a summary of this process, see Appendix A of this report.)

It is believed that community involvement will facilitate the exchange of information between installations and communities and will likely contribute directly to the identification and mitigation of noise impacts and problems. The focal objective of community involvement is to effect agreements between these institutions that will prevent community land uses that are incompatible with installation noise impacts.

The 20 TRADOC installations are being required to implement an ICUZ process with the community involvement component. As of April 1986, most of the TRADOC installations had attended the ICUZ training course and had initiated their ICUZ studies. The ICUZ studies are scheduled to be completed by the end of fiscal 1987 (11).

1.2 PURPOSE

In the interest of contributing to the overall success of the ICUZ community involvement efforts, TRADOC is documenting the experiences at some installations for the benefit of each of the others. With the assistance of the Institute for Water Resources, an evaluation of ICUZ community involvement efforts at Fort Knox was undertaken in the summer of 1985 (5).

A similar investigation was carried out in the spring of 1986 to document ICUZ experiences at Fort McClellan. This report describes and discusses the methods and findings of this most recent evaluation. As explained below, this is an interim report of a continuing study of Fort McClellan experiences.

1.3 METHODS

The ICUZ program at Fort McClellan is in progress, but not yet to a point where the community involvement activities have all been initiated. Nonetheless the program has been underway for a considerable time and it is believed that documentation of that experience will be informative and instructive to others.

Given this general status of the Fort McClellan efforts, a two phase approach to the evaluation of ICUZ was adopted. This is a report of the first phase of the evaluation. It presents the background for ICUZ at Fort McClellan, and outlines activities undertaken up to the present (April 1986).

It is anticipated that when the ICUZ study is completed at Fort McClellan later this year that the second phase of the investigation will be initiated. This additional research is expected to result in documentation of the entire ICUZ effort and the community involvement process at this installation.

Neither this investigation nor the earlier one of Fort Knox is intended as a critical review of the installation or community activities pertaining to ICUZ. Each is an evaluation intended to be instructive and constructive. The goal is to communicate "lessons learned."

The basic methods employed to discover the "lessons" of ICUZ at Fort McClellan are borrowed from the earlier study of Fort Knox with appropriate modifications to suit the differences in circumstance and progress. Experiences are reconstructed from information contained in documents and obtained in interviews.

This information was gathered during a three-day visit to Fort McClellan in mid April 1986, and through subsequent telephone conversations with Fort McClellan personnel. A record of all persons interviewed appears in Table 1, and the documents from which information was gleaned are listed as references.

Table 1

ICUZ PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED

A. DURING FIELD RESEARCH (APRIL 14-17, 1986):

- o **LTC. Pincince, Director
Directorate of Engineering and Housing**
- o **Mr. Clark, Chief
Environmental Management Office**
- o **Mr. Pittman, Environmental Coordinator
Environmental Management Office**
- o **Mr. Garland, Environmental Specialist
Environmental Management Office**
- o **CPT. Perry, Claims Officer
Staff Judge Advocate**
- o **MAJ. Banks, Public Affairs Officer
Public Affairs Office**
- o **CPT. Deegan, Range Control Officer
Directorate of Plans and Training (Security)**
- o **LTC. Pugh, Director
Directorate of Reserve Components**
- o **Mr. Hamilton, Director of Planning
East Alabama Regional Planning and
Development Commission**

B. BY TELEPHONE AFTER FIELD RESEARCH:

- o **Mr. Pittman, Environmental Coordinator
Environmental Management Office**

2.0 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM SETTING AND ACTIVITIES

In addition to the general findings of the investigation of ICUZ activities at Fort McClellan, general information about the installation and the surrounding area is provided in an effort to characterize the setting for the ICUZ program.

2.1 PROGRAM SETTING

The ICUZ program at Fort McClellan involves the installation and the communities and people of the surrounding area. The profiles of these two components of the program setting will facilitate interpretation and evaluation of ICUZ activities.

Fort McClellan. This installation is the site of a number of different activities. It is the home of two service schools, the US Army Chemical and Military Police schools, is a basic training center, and a field training area for National Guard and Army Reserve units.

Three parcels of land, totaling nearly 46 thousand acres, are involved. All are located in Calhoun county in the northeast section of Alabama. The Main Post is adjacent to the city of Anniston; to the east is the Choccolocco Corridor; and Pelham Range is about eight miles to the west.

The Anniston Army Depot is directly to the south of the Range. It is the site of storage and repair facilities for a variety of ordnance and vehicles. The

primary mission of this 15,000 acre reservation is tank overhaul. Tank guns and other kinds of weapons are test fired on the northern part of the Depot.

Training activities on the Main Post include small arms fire. Pelham Range, however, contains ranges for artillery, mortar, and tanks. Units of the National Guard and the Army Reserves train there primarily on weekends and during summer months.

Fort McClellan was established in 1917, and has been a major part of the area economy since then. In 1975 Fort McClellan accounted for 12 percent of all employment in Calhoun county, and the Anniston Army Depot was responsible for another 10 percent (2).

In fiscal year 1982, the Depot provided the area with 5,000 jobs and was its largest employer. That same year the Fort McClellan budget was \$245 million, with \$45 million of that going for civilian payroll, while another \$143 million went for military pay (10).

Calhoun County. Created in 1832 by the Alabama legislature, this northeast Alabama county of about 611 square miles lies between Atlanta and Birmingham in the Appalachian Highlands. Elevations range between 485 feet and about 2100 feet above sea level. With an average annual temperature of about 62°, the climate is considered to be temperate (2).

The county is governed by a three-man commission, which has responsibility for all functions except education. Places which are incorporated include Blue Mountain, Hobson City, Jacksonville, Ohatchee, Oxford, Piedmont, Weaver, and the county seat of Anniston (10).

Some of these incorporated places practice land use planning and have controls; however, the relevant town laws and their enforcement tend to be weak. The county lacks the enabling state legislation which would permit it to exercise control over land use in areas outside of the incorporated areas (9).

Until Fort McClellan was established in 1917, Calhoun county had an agricultural economy. The military installation was a major factor in the urbanization of the county. The cast iron pipe industry also contributed, until it experienced a major decline in 1973. By 1975, 22 percent of county workers were employed by the Army and 68 percent more in industry (2).

The influence of Fort McClellan and Anniston Army Depot upon the economy of the county is illustrated by the percentage of county residents employed by government. In 1970, 23 percent, compared to regional and state figures of 15 and 17, were so employed. This number increased to 27 percent by 1980 (3).

The 1980 population of Calhoun county was nearly 120 thousand, having increased from about 103 thousand in 1970, a rate of growth greater than either the region, state, or the country. In the same period, the percent of residences that were urban increased from 64 to 76 percent. Between 1980 and 1982, the population grew 3.3 percent, or by about 4 thousand people (3).

Although the county population is becoming more urban, growth is expected in some unincorporated, rural areas. One area of particular interest is that bordering the eastern boundry of Pelham Range, where blast noise is currently

being experienced. It is estimated that population in the general area including the towns of Llyod's Chapel and Leatherwood will increase by between 26 and 45 percent by 2004. About 100 new dwelling units are expected to be built in the Leatherwood area during this period (4).

Implications. The military missions of Fort McClellan and the Anniston Army Depot involve the firing of heavy weapons which generate considerable levels of blast noise. Relevant training activities on Pelham Range are intermitant, but their frequency and intensity have increased in recent years. While the ridge and valley topography and forested nature of the area helps to moderate the noise generated by small arms fire on the Main Post and Pelham Range, blast noise stemming from heavy weapons fire on Pelham Range tends to be dampened much less by these conditions.

Population in the county, including the rural areas adjacent to Pelham Range, is increasing and is expected to continue to increase for the foreseeable future. Suburbanization can be expected to increase in the county as incorporated towns grow to capacity and highway systems are improved. The increasing growth in government employment and general dependence of the economy on the military installations will contribute to more growth close to these centers of employment. In general, the inclination will be to build on available and accessible land that may be otherwise suitable for development, but may be increasingly subject to noise and its impacts.

2.2 ICUZ ACTIVITIES

The basic chronology of ICUZ activities at Fort McClellan is summarized in Table 2. The ICUZ process began in May 1982 with the first on-site visit for the ICUZ noise study, performed by the Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA). That visit resulted in a Phase 1 report published in the fall of that year. The final phase of the noise study was completed two years later in August 1984, and was later modified in a June 1985 report.

The TRADOC installation briefing and community involvement training were held at Fort McClellan in July and September 1984. The ICUZ committee was formed in conjunction with the training. Soon after the training, a community involvement plan was completed in December 1984, and in January 1985 a letter and summary of the plan were sent to the community leaders. (Copies of these documents are appended to this report.)

At the present time (April 1986), the Fort McClellan ICUZ team is continuing with its efforts to inform and interact with the public and community leaders in the surrounding area in order to achieve their focal objective of obtaining agreements that might prevent incompatible land uses in noise impacted areas.

Table 2
ICUZ STUDY CHRONOLOGY

- Nov 1982** o **Noise Study (Phase 1) results are reported**

- Jul 1984** o **Installation Briefing given by TRADOC**

- Aug 1984** o **Noise Study (Final Phase) results reported**

- Sep 1984** o **Training Course held at Fort McClellan**
 o **ICUZ Committee established**

- Oct 1984** o **Presentation for Commanders and Directors**

- Dec 1984** o **Plan for ICUZ Study completed and signed**

- Jan 1985** o **Letter/Summary Plan sent to community leaders**
 o **Noise Study modifications requested by letter**

- Apr 1985** o **Noise Study completion (w/o MK 19) requested**

- Jun 1985** o **Noise Study (Modified) results are reported**

3.0 DISCUSSION: THE PROGRAM AND ITS PROGRESS

3.1 PROGRAM STATUS

The Fort McClellan ICUZ community involvement plan indicates a January 1985 completion date for the final report describing local land use agreements and documenting the process resulting in the achievement of that objective. To date, the objective has not been met, and the report has not been prepared.

The reasons for this apparent lack of progress are numerous, and potentially instructive to review. This discussion will describe the conditions and events associated with the ICUZ process at Fort McClellan in the interest of illuminating its problems and prospects.

Basic milestones from the community involvement plan are summarized in Table 3. Steps 3 through 7 are not completed and have been rescheduled at the request of TRADOC. While a letter and summary plan were sent to community leaders more than a year ago, the lack of response and effective followup means that work remains on steps 1 and 2 as well.

An overview of the ICUZ situation at Fort McClellan suggests a wide range of problems that probably have contributed to study progress. These conditions and events are not unique to Fort McClellan. Thus, the manner in which they constitute problems and the manner in which they are eventually dealt with will be instructive to other ICUZ study teams. The basic problems will be discussed in terms of (1) noise studies, (2) the study team, and (3) local views.

Table 3

ICUZ COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

A. STEPS IDENTIFIED FOR THE PROCESS:

- 1/2. Identify noise-impacted areas and existing or potential incompatible land uses.
3. Identify alternative actions to minimize noise impacts.
4. Evaluate alternative actions.
5. Negotiate draft agreements with local communities.
6. Submit draft agreements and letters of intent to TRADOC.
7. Publish final report describing agreements and technical documentation.

B. RELATED MILESTONES AND PROGRESS:

| <u>MILESTONES</u> | <u>DUE DATE</u> | <u>ACTUAL</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| o send letters to communities | Jan 85 | Jan 85 |
| o receive replies to letters | Feb 85 | |
| o produce noise contour map(s) | Apr 85 | |
| o develop list of mitigations | Jun 85 | -->May 86 |
| o evaluate mitigative actions | Aug 85 | -->Aug 86 |
| o receive letters of intent | Oct 85 | -->Oct 86 |
| o submit draft agreements | Nov 85 | -->Nov 86 |
| o complete ICUZ final report | Jan 86 | -->Jan 87 |
| o monitor relative activities | Jan 86 and beyond | |
| o convene committee yearly | Jan 87 and beyond | |

3.2 NOISE STUDIES

A minimum of six noise studies have been undertaken at Fort McClellan since early 1982. Table 4 contains a listing of these studies. Three versions of the ICUZ noise study are included. The other studies are associated with siting and environmental assessments.

ICUZ Phase 1. The first phase of the ICUZ noise study was conducted in May 1982 and reported in November of that year (13). The scope of the study was determined cooperatively by Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA) and Fort McClellan personnel, and included a range of contemporary and anticipated noise producing facilities and activities.

To address potential small arms noise problems of concern to Fort McClellan, AEHA decided to provide a computer model to the installation. This noise simulation tool was to be sent to the Environmental Management Office as Phase 2 of the ICUZ noise study. AEHA's desire to base this model on forthcoming data resulted in delay in its development, and it was delivered in August 1984.


This first study found that a Zone II noise contour extended about 2 kilometers east of the Pelham Range boundary in the general vicinity of Lloyd's Chapel (Figure 1), and that the noise was attributable to machine gun fire. No blast or aircraft noise problems were discovered.

The investigators concluded that noise from Fort McClellan was not likely to disturb area residents, except those who might later come to live on the

Table 4
INSTALLATION NOISE STUDIES

| <u>NAME/DESCRIPTION</u> | <u>REPORT DATE</u> |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Grenade Range | Mar 1982 |
| ICUZ Phase 1 | Nov 1982 |
| ICUZ Final Phase | Aug 1984 |
| Tank Range EA | Aug 1984 |
| MK-19 Range EA | Oct 1984 |
| ICUZ Modification | Jun 1985 |

Figure 1



farmland within the noise contour extending beyond the installation. However, AEHA strongly recommended that these simulated noise impacts be verified by onsite measurements before using this data in the ICUZ program.

Lacking any apparent urgency, Fort McClellan failed to request the recommended noise survey until early in 1985, when it also requested other monitoring and further simulation studies (see discussion below). With hindsight, it is clear now that this recommended verification could have helped to preclude problems encountered with the public in early 1984 (see discussion below).

ICUZ Final Phase. The second ICUZ noise study at Fort McClellan was conducted in June and July of 1984 and was reported soon after in August (14). This study was called the "final phase" and contained the code and documentation of the computer model promised in the Phase 1 report of November 1982. It additionally responded to a February 1984 request for a tank range noise study.

The Alabama Army National Guard proposed to conduct training fire of its tanks on the Pelham Range (1), and Fort McClellan was interested in learning how that action might affect the noise contours developed in the first phase of the noise study. AEHA concluded that while the gunnery would expand the contour immediately associated with it, no additional noise impacts would result.

However, the investigators recommended that Fort McClellan define an "average busy day" for blast noise activities to enable them to produce an

alternate set of noise contours. This action was motivated by noise complaints lodged by the residents of Llyod's Chapel at an April 1984 public meeting regarding the tank gunnery. These complaints of blast noise called into question the validity of the earlier contours.

AEHA also reminded Fort McClellan that it had earlier (in the Phase 1 study report) recommended that the machine gun noise simulations responsible for the encroaching Zone II contour be verified with onsite measurements. Lastly, AEHA recommended that the provided small arms noise prediction software be added to the installation's environmental computer programs.

As noted below, Fort McClellan was to finally request onsite measurement of the suspected machine gun noise in early 1985. However, incorporation and use of the small arms noise model was not to happen. The installation lacked the personnel and facilities to make this a feasible approach to noise analysis.

ICUZ Modification. The most recent ICUZ noise study at Fort McClellan occurred in April 1985 and was reported that June (15). Its purpose was to see how changes in range locations and operational assumptions may redefine the earlier noise contours. The changes in question were specified by letter to AEHA in January and March of 1985 (6,7).

Fort McClellan asked for noise contours for small arms fire on the Main Post and for a redefinition based on movement of a small arms range on Pelham Range (for it could make no use of the computer model provided by AEHA). Also requested was the reduction of the averaging period for blast noise from 365 to 104 days (representing the number of weekend days in a year). In

addition, a noise survey consisting of on-site measurement was scheduled with AEHA for April 1985.

The primary purpose of this scheduled noise survey was to measure noise generated by the MK 19 Grenade Machine Gun, since simulations of MK 19 firing on Pelham Range were considered inappropriate (7). Another purpose was to verify the machine gun noise which the original simulation study identified as being responsible for the encroaching annoyance zone. The noise survey was cancelled because MK 19 rounds were not available.

The ICUZ noise study of April 1985 found that by using a 104 day average for heavy weapons noise (blast) the contours are not only expanded but the encroaching contour is now defined by blast noise and not by the machine gun as earlier thought. This finding is consistent with the observations of citizens living near the affected area.

The basic recommendation of this study was to incorporate the new noise contours into the ICUZ program. Further, AEHA made it clear that Fort McClellan should request onsite measurement of the MK 19 if and when the weapon and rounds are available.

Overview. This history of ICUZ noise studies at Fort McClellan is instructive for several reasons. It illustrates that noise changes associated with mission changes are to be expected, and that environmental noise assessment must be a continuing process. It also highlights the complexity of noise studies, and confirms the need for onsite measurements in some cases.

The general idea behind the initial ICUZ noise study was to provide Fort McClellan with current noise contours for use in its ICUZ program. The noise study was conducted in May 1982 and reported in November 1982. The ICUZ program, however, did not begin until the summer of 1984 when the Commanding General of the installation was briefed by TRADOC.

That initial study provided noise contours for Pelham Range, promised a computer program for Main Post (and other) noise simulations for small arms fire, and recommended that small arms noise encroaching on civilian farm land be verified by onsite measurement. The program was delivered with the final phase report in August 1984, but never used. The AEHA onsite verification process did not occur and the recommendation was finally withdrawn in the June 1985 noise assessment report.

In the meantime, the Alabama Army National Guard proposed to fire its tanks on Pelham Range, and an environmental impact assessment was initiated. Fort McClellan asked that phase 1 noise contours be revised as needed to reflect this activity. This revision was accomplished and was included in the final report. No additional annoyance was anticipated.

However, as part of the environmental assessment process, the installation discovered during a public meeting (April 1984) that residents in the Llyod's Chapel area were annoyed not by machine gun fire but by heavy weapons noise coming from Pelham Range (not the Guard tanks). This "complaint" threw into doubt the validity of the initial and the final contours.

These questions and doubts about the noise contours appeared to be technically

resolved in the June 1985 study, which did conclude that the encroaching contour was defined by blast noise from the heavy weapons range, a finding consistent with the complaints lodged. However, the report left unresolved the question of noise impact from a new training activity involving the MK 19.

Thus, when the Fort McClellan ICUZ program got underway, the study team had incomplete noise information, about which they had doubts due to (1) the recommendations of the noise studies and (2) the observations of some area residents. Moreover, some study team members had been involved in the environmental assessment process, and had experienced directly the information problems encountered at the public meeting.

In view of this evolution, it is understandable why ICUZ noise contours have not been shared or discussed with communities or organizations in the surrounding area as part of the ICUZ study process.

3.3 STUDY TEAM

Further light can be shed upon ICUZ progress at Fort McClellan, including coordination with AEHA and the utilization of noise studies, by looking at the ICUZ committee, the study team, and related events. Current committee membership is summarized in Table 5. Which members make up the ICUZ study team, having the day-to-day responsibility for implementing the program, is not clear. That duty seems to reside exclusively with the person from the Directorate of Engineering and Housing.

Table 5

CURRENT REPRESENTATION ON THE ICUZ COMMITTEE

1. **Directorate of Engineering and Housing**
 - o **Environmental Coordinator**
Mr. Pittman
2. **Staff Judge Advocate**
 - o **Claims Officer***
CPT. Perry
3. **Public Affairs Office**
 - o **Public Affairs Officer***
MAJ. Banks
4. **Directorate of Plans and Training (Security)**
 - o **Range Control Officer***
CPT. Deegan
5. **Training Brigades/Branch Schools**
 - o **Director of Reserve Components***
LTC. Pugh

* Individuals who received the ICUZ Community Involvement Training at Fort McClellan, Sept. 17-21, 1984.

Team Membership. The composition of the ICUZ committee is fairly consistent with TRADOC guidance. Absent from the recommended list (17) are the Deputy Installation Commander, the Director of Engineering and Housing, and the Master Planner. Given the oversight function of the Installation Planning Board, and the general importance of planning in the ICUZ process, omission of the Master Planner is significant.

While the Deputy Installation Commander and the Director of Engineering and Housing are members of the Installation Planning Board (8), their direct involvement in the ICUZ process would serve to fortify its overall authority and potential effectiveness. As it is, the committee lacks the scope of authority desired, and is too large to efficiently discharge the day-to-day responsibilities of a study team.

Team Activity. The ICUZ committee was formed and trained in September 1984, and prepared an ICUZ community involvement plan signed by the Installation Commander in December 1984. It was also involved in identifying potentially affected and interested communities and organizations to which a letter and summary plan were sent in January 1985. Since then it has been inactive.

Team Stability. During the time that this ICUZ program has been in progress, personnel changes have occurred at all levels of authority and responsibility. For example, the Installation Commander who initiated the process was replaced by a new commander in July 1985, midway through the year in which the major goals of the program were to be achieved.

The greatest change occurred in the Directorate of Engineering and Housing. In addition to receiving a new Director in July 1984, changes occurred in both the environmental and planning offices of the directorate. A new Master Planner arrived in November 1984, six months after the position was vacated in May. During that period, the ICUZ program was initiated and the training took place (without a Master Planner).

In addition, the Chief of the Environmental Management Office left for a one-year leave of absence in January 1985, just as the initial contact was made with the surrounding communities and the community involvement program got started. Until his departure, he had been the person responsible for day-to-day implementation of the program.

The changes occurring in the environmental office are especially important, since the day-to-day responsibilities for noise and for ICUZ reside there. The positions of Chief and Coordinator both experienced changes since ICUZ got started, and the point of contact for noise and for ICUZ has moved between positions and individuals during this period (Table 6).

Implications. These circumstances with the Fort McClellan ICUZ study team (outlined in Table 7) have diminished its capacity to function effectively. The basic problem is that the team has lacked strong and steady leadership. The committee has been too inactive to provide the needed leadership, and the numerous personnel changes in the responsible directorate (DEH) have kept a leader from emerging at that level.

Table 6

ICUZ STUDY POINTS-OF-CONTACT

1. Mr. Lacey
Master Planner, DEH
From: start To: May 84
2. Mr. Clark*
Chief, Environmental Management Office
From: Jun 84 To: Dec 84
3. Mr. Garland*
Environmental Specialist
From: Jan 85 To: Dec 85
4. Mr. Pittman
Environmental Coordinator
From: Jan 86 To: present

* Individuals who received ICUZ training.

Table 7
SUMMARY OF ICUZ CIRCUMSTANCES

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nov 1982 | o Noise Study (Phase 1) results are reported |
| May 1984 | o POC for noise and ICUZ is replaced |
| Jul 1984 | o Installation Briefing given by TRADOC o Director of DEH is replaced |
| Aug 1984 | o Noise Study (Final Phase) results reported |
| Sep 1984 | o Training Course held at Fort McClellan o ICUZ Committee established |
| Oct 1984 | o Presentation for Commanders and Directors |
| Dec 1984 | o Plan for ICUZ Study completed and signed o Team Leader and POC for ICUZ is replaced |
| Jan 1985 | o Letter/Summary Plan sent to community leaders o Noise Study modifications requested by letter |
| Apr 1985 | o Noise Study completion (w/o MK 19) requested |
| Jun 1985 | o Noise Study (Modified) results are reported |
| Jul 1985 | o Installation Commander is replaced |
| Dec 1985 | o Team Leader and POC for ICUZ is replaced |

3.4 LOCAL VIEWS

The Fort McClellan ICUZ committee informed the surrounding communities and selected organizations about their program in January 1985. A letter signed by the Commanding General accompanied by a summary of the community involvement plan was mailed to nine municipal mayors, one county commission, and two civic organizations (Table 8, Appendix C and D).

This correspondence provided considerable information about the program, invited questions and comments, and expressly asked for information about noise impacts and development plans. Not one of the recipients of this information has responded, and Fort McClellan has not tried to follow-up in any way.

Why did the public not respond and why did the installation not follow-up? It could be that both sides were "frozen" by their views -- by their definitions of the situation and by their perceptions of each other. Views on planning, impacts, and the Army, may be involved.

View of Planning. With or without community involvement, ICUZ is a land use planning exercise. The Army wants to influence local area land use in the interest of its military mission and the public health and safety. The problem is that land use planning varies in appeal and in use. Some places and people live by it, while others do not even like it. Planning implies control, and some people don't want private property controlled by public agencies or officials. They prefer to retain their rights.

Table 8
COMMUNITIES AND GROUPS INFORMED OF ICUZ STUDY*

A. MAYORS OF THE FOLLOWING COMMUNITIES:

- o Alexandria
- o Anniston
- o Blue Mountain
- o Hobson City
- o Jacksonville
- o Ohatchee
- o Oxford
- o Piedmont
- o Weaver

B. LEADERS OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS:

- o Calhoun County Commission
- o Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce
- o Home Builders Association of Greater Calhoun County
- o East Alabama Regional Planning Commission (EAC)**

* A letter, with a "Summary Plan of Action" enclosed, was sent to each mayor and leader in early 1985.

** The Director of Planning of the EAC attended the ICUZ training at Fort McClellan.

In general, the area surrounding Fort McClellan is not one to strongly advocate land use planning (9). The county government lacks enabling legislation from the state and therefore it has no authority to control land use. Some of the municipalities practice land use control, but the laws and their enforcement tend to be weak.

The letter and plan sent to local leaders invited them to get involved in the ICUZ program, but the use of land use control was stressed. If the above observation about the area has any validity, then the thrust of the communication probably served to squelch any interest the communities may have had in getting involved and helping.

View of Impacts. Fort McClellan has been in Calhoun county for about 80 years, and it has been a significant part of the area economy for most of that period. Many of the area residents work for the Army, either at Fort McClellan or at the Anniston Depot, and many others have jobs supported by the spending of Army employees, contractors, and military personnel.

Thus, the area economy and many of its residents are dependent upon the Army for jobs and income. This simple, but important, fact is likely to affect how communities and residents perceive and respond to noise and other potentially annoying effects of Army activities. Acceptance of such costs is conditioned by associated benefits.

The letter sent to community mayors and others stated that the Army/Fort McClellan was interested in "resolving conflict with communities" and "continuing to be a good neighbor." To the extent that economic dependence

is a felt condition of life in the area, the language of the letter may have inhibited formal response.

Communities and residents may not perceive any noise problems worth discussing with the Army, if they believe that admitting to annoyance suggests that conflict-in-need-of-reslotuion may exist or that the installation is not being a good neighbor. Under the circumstances, response to this letter may be considered to be "trouble-making."

View of the Army. The last point is how the environmental assessment process for the Alabama Army National Guard tank gunnery may have affected views of the ICUZ program. Fort McClellan may have lost some credibility as a result of that community involvement process and subsequent circumstances.

Information about noise impacts that the Army shared with the public in that process proved to be contrary to the experience of the affected residents. Study results showed that impacts were due to small arms fire, but, as the Army later confirmed, the residents said it was heavy weapons noise that they heard.

A demonstration of tank firing at the proposed gunnery site suggested that noise impacts would occur, and a different site farther from the affected residents was selected. The noise study of firing at this site, reported in the Environmental Assessment, concluded there would be no significant impact.

Since the tank gunnery has been in use, many complaints have been lodged with the installation, and it is claimed that during some atmospheric conditions

(low clouds) the noise can be heard in distant cities within the county. Thus, once again Army information seems at odds with public experience.

To the extent that this situation has reduced the credibility of Fort McClellan, communities and organizations may hesitate to cooperate with the Army in a process in which they may be asked to deal in good faith on the basis of noise information provided by the Army. They may prefer to react to conditions and events that they experience.

Interpretation. It would not have been appropriate in this investigation to attempt to ascertain the validity of these explanations for the failure of communities to respond to the letter sent to them by the installation. Nonetheless, while these points remain untested hypotheses, they appear to be plausible explanations of this community behavior.

In the course of interviewing the ICUZ committee members it became clear that these observations about local conditions and culture are commonly held understandings. The committee believes, for example, that the local population and most of its institutions are opposed to (effective) land use planning and regulation.

Committee members also understand that Calhoun county is an "Army town" with a substantial dependence upon installation jobs and dollars, and most local people and institutions are likely to tolerate the moderate adverse impacts of military activities, including occasional noise. The committee also believes that its credibility on noise impacts is low in the surrounding communities.

These popular beliefs about local conditions and culture may help to explain why the ICUZ committee has done very little since January 1985 to try to get the surrounding communities involved in their ICUZ program, especially since the beliefs appear to have been proven correct by the failure of local communities to accept the committee's formal invitation.

In summary, there appears to be a local view, accepted by the ICUZ committee, which includes (1) denial of any real problem (your noise is tolerable), (2) dread of the proposed solution (land use control is not), and (3) distrust of provided data (we'll wait and see). The committee should be sensitive to these possibilities, but can not afford to be stymied by them.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

In the following sections, suggestions for improving the program and its progress at Fort McClellan are provided, followed by an outline of "lessons learned" through the experiences at this installation.

4.1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Basic Problem. To date, the Fort McClellan ICUZ program has not progressed beyond the initial steps of the prescribed process, and its prospects for the future are uncertain. Why is this the case? Problems related to local views, the study team, and noise studies have been described. But why have these problems prevailed? One factor may be perspective.

ICUZ is a change management process; community involvement is a key supporting process. Committees, teams, and leaders that see ICUZ in this light stand the greatest chance of success. The "solution" to these common problems is to get involved in the process. Plans, studies, and letters will not manage the change. It must be directed from the inside with interaction.

The shortcomings of information and institutions are reasons for getting involved, not for fixing or waiting. Involvement at the installation and in the community is the answer. The ICUZ effort at Fort McClellan has been one of fixing and waiting. The problems took over when waiting for communities and fixing noise contours became the focus in early 1985.

Over a year of involvement time has been lost, and problems with local views, the study team, and noise studies persist and continue to distract team efforts. Progress will remain stalled until the committee and team get involved once again in the ICUZ process, and a commitment is made to get involved in interactions with the community.

In the following sections, suggestions for improving progress at Fort McClellan are provided, and several recommendations for the ICUZ program in general are outlined. These points pertain to problems of involvement, information, leadership, noise studies, and ICUZ training.

Involvement. The ICUZ committee, the study team, and the team leader should all become much more involved in the process. Frequent meetings of the committee are required to keep the effort charged with information and authority, and to guide the study team.

In keeping with TRADOC guidance (17), membership on the ICUZ committee should be expanded to include the Deputy Commander, the Director of Engineering and Housing, and the Master Planner. Moreover, an interdisciplinary study team should be established, perhaps to include the Master Planner, the Public Affairs Officer, and the Environmental Coordinator.

The work of the study team should be divided among the members along functional lines, with coordination and integration the responsibility of the Environmental Coordinator, as the leader. The members should communicate frequently and the team should meet as needed. Help with other competing duties should be provided.

The study leader should attend the first possible ICUZ training program, and otherwise become more familiar with the principles and procedures of ICUZ. He should also understand the history of the program at the installation, and study the socioeconomic aspects of the surrounding area.

Information. It is vastly important that the study team, and others who may deal with the public on ICUZ, are kept informed about relevant installation plans and activities. This is one excellent reason for proper constitution and frequent meetings of the ICUZ committee.

The study team should have the best possible information about noise associated with installation activities. AEHA should be asked to produce new contours as needed, but only when changes in activity are understood and can be clearly defined. Models provided the team by AEHA should be used as appropriate.

Interaction with local communities and organizations should be reinitiated with a general program of public information about the ICUZ program and its application at Fort McClellan. Video taped programs prepared for TRADOC should be used to introduce the program.

To start this campaign, the assistance of the Eastern Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission ought to be accepted, and the information program should be given to every relevant group associated with the Commission. This exposure, and the contacts made, should be used to expand the campaign.

This campaign should reach the residents of unincorporated parts of the county, perhaps with county sponsored briefings or meetings in selected areas. Lack of land use planning and controls in such areas should not exclude their residents from the benefit of the public information program.

Leadership. Many of the changes recommended above will afford greater opportunities for leadership to emerge in this ICUZ process. With more individuals active in more activities, the leadership required for program success will surface.

However, the leader of the study team should be designated and prepared for the role. Adequate preparation will include ICUZ training, either at the next session or at the installation by the TRADOC technical assistance consultant.

In addition, the study leader should be given sufficient relief from other competing duties to allow him to concentrate on ICUZ as needed. If the team is expanded and the ICUZ work distributed among all members, the leader nor the others should be especially overburdened.

The public information campaign should be utilized to generate interest and activity in the surrounding area. Workshops and other kinds of gatherings should follow. Community leadership with an instrumental interest in ICUZ should emerge in the process.

Noise Studies. It was the general consensus of the committee members that a better system of estimating and representing noise is needed. In particular, the apparent discrepancy between noise impact depicted by contours and zones

and that experienced by people in the area was judged to be a potential problem.

Committee members attributed this discrepancy to the methods used in the noise studies. Particular faults suggested were (1) the disregard for conditions of terrain and weather, and (2) the practice of averaging the blast noise for as much as one year. These contouring practices tend to understate the noise impacts in many cases.

In theory, however, the contouring methodology can accommodate such variation. But, as a practical matter, only atmospheric inversion factors and number of training days are changed from the defaults of 1.5 and 365. AERA has been using installation provided values for number of training days when requested to do so. Fort McClellan made such a request in early 1985.

The apparent discrepancy between contours and perceptions was seen as a potential credibility problem in dealings with the public. Indeed, some of the committee members had experienced such a problem during a public meeting in conjunction with the proposed tank gunnery. In addition to the perceived problem of credibility, professional integrity was expressed as an issue.

This general problem with the ICUZ noise studies is two-sided. While the methods and results may lack the rigor and precision commonly expected of a physical science, an equal or greater problem is the interpretation and use of the results. The limits and proper uses of these studies should be stressed during the ICUZ training.

ICUZ Training. Committee member comments about their training were mixed. Most thought that the ICUZ community involvement training provided a good general framework for a program, and that it was presented well by the instructor. But, some felt that the material was "scientific" and that the training needs to include "practical" instruction in how to apply ICUZ.

One committee member noted that he received too little advance information about ICUZ and the training, and consequently was not able to properly prepare for the experience. He believed that the training would have been of much greater instrumental value if he had been given warning and time to research things.

These two points and the comment that the training was longer than necessary, suggest the need for a two-phase approach to ICUZ training. The first part should be "theoretical" and be given to the entire committee during the first two days of the training. The last part should be "practical" and be targeted to the study team.

Finally, one committee member suggested rather strongly that the training merely offered the "scientific approach to what we were already doing here." This comment reinforces the recommendation that the training be more practical, and that it focus on installation specific applications.

4.2 SOME LESSONS LEARNED

The ICUZ program at Fort McClellan is presently stalled at a very early point

in the prescribed process. Consequently, a majority of the opportunities for learning lessons from this process lie ahead. Nonetheless, there are important lessons to be gained from the Fort McClellan experiences outlined in this report.

Points Recaped. A few points have been expressed or implied above that suggest opportunities for learning some lessons. These points are outlined, and what appear to be the basic lessons are summarized.

- o The ICUZ committee must have the proper representation and authority and must be actively involved in the process for it to be effective and contribute to the success of the program.

- o Neither the ICUZ committee, nor any one individual member, is an adequate substitute for an active study team staffed on the basis of program needs and team member skills.

- o ICUZ study team leadership, membership continuity, regular interaction, and coordination and integration of work efforts are essential ingredients for program progress and success.

- o ICUZ noise studies will be subject to updating for as long as the military mission at an installation (including weapons selection and training activities) remains variable.

- o The "science" of ICUZ noise studies is inexact and results are approximate and statistical; consequently, use of onsite surveys and attention to local experiences are important.

- o Perception and reaction to installation noise is cultural and situational, requiring that programs account for present conditions and recent, relevant events in local communities.

- o Whatever the local views, the community involvement plan, and team, must recognize the need to seek and find means of achieving the ICUZ program goals.

- o The shortcomings of information and institutions (such as noise data and local planning) are the best possible reasons for interaction, not good excuses for inaction.

- o The ICUZ program is a process, installation and community involvement in cooperative interaction; while it will result in a series of products, first and foremost, it is a process.

Primary Lesson. Preparation and planning are requisites for success. The ICUZ program at Fort McClellan appears to lack the advantages of careful preparation and planning. This is reflected in the Community Involvement Plan and in committee efforts to implement the plan.

The plan appears to be adequate; however, a lack of progress in the program suggests otherwise. It seems clear that both the plan and the implementation efforts reflect insufficient attention to fundamental aspects of TRADOC guidance and ICUZ training.

In particular, community involvement at Fort McClellan lacks the integration with the study and decision making processes that is prescribed by TRADOC and facilitated by the "thought process" taught in the training course (17). The focus upon study circumstances afforded by this process is also missing.

For example, a more carefully thought-out program would most likely not have relied upon a very formal letter to initiate interaction with local communities, given the popular belief about land use controls and the very recent public relations experience surrounding the siting of the tank gunnery.

Other Lessons. Specific lessons of particular significance include the following:

Noise studies are an important, but limited, component of an ICUZ program. Every effort should be made to obtain current, complete, and accurate noise data. But careful attention to its proper use in community involvement is equally critical.

Noise zones reflect different probabilities of being annoyed. Each represents a range. Zone II, for example, defines that area bounded by the noise levels which 15% and 39% of people find highly annoying. Above and below this middle range are the other two zones (Zone I <15% and Zone III >39%).

This method of impact representation is clearly approximate, and has limited meaning and use. It would be inappropriate to focus attention on the contours dividing the zones since they represent only a nominal difference in impact and they move in response to a single decibel change in noise level.

The goal of the program is to anticipate and mitigate noise impacts, and preclude the conflicts and other problems that can result from such impacts. More important for this goal than the exact location of a contour line is the pattern of change in that line and in the population circumscribed by it.

Continuous interaction with the surrounding communities is essential for a meaningful and effective ICUZ program. A fundamental premise of this Army program is that change is occurring on military installations and in the communities around them. While the focal objective is to obtain local commitments to compatible land uses, it is understood that these agreements are the starting point of what must be a continuing process of interaction with local communities.

There is a natural tendency to work toward definable ends, such as plans, agreements, and reports. This common goal orientation is facilitating in most circumstances, and the ICUZ program is no exception. However, attention to these "products" must not be allowed to obscure the simple, but essential, fact that ICUZ, and most especially community involvement, is a process that must continue indefinitely.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Alabama National Guard Environmental Assessment for Construction of a Tank Table VI at Pelham Range, Fort McClellan, Alabama," August 1984.
- [2] East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission, "Overall Economic Development Program for Calhoun County," circa 1976.
- [3] East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission, "Socio-Economic Data for East Alabama Region," undated.
- [4] East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission, "Calhoun Area Transportation Study: Zonal Estimates 1984 and 2004," forthcoming.
- [5] "Evaluation of Installation Compatible Use Zone (ICUZ) Community Involvement Process at Fort Knox, Kentucky," draft report, October 1985.
- [6] Letter, ATZN-FEE, US Army Chemical and Military Police Centers and Fort McClellan, 21 January 1985, Subject: Finalization of Noise Zone Contours on Fort McClellan, Alabama.
- [7] Letter, ATZN-FEE, US Army Chemical and Military Police Centers and Fort McClellan, 20 March 1985, Subject: Revised Requirements for Developing Noise Contours on Fort McClellan.
- [8] Letter, ATZN-FEP, US Army Chemical and Military Police Centers and Fort McClellan, 10 May 1983, Subject: Requirements for Planning and Public Involvement Information Related to Installation Compatible Use Zone (ICUZ) Studies.
- [9] Personal communication, Interview with Tim Hamilton, Director of Planning, East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission, April 17, 1986.
- [10] Public Affairs Office, Fort McClellan, Alabama, "Community Survey: Anniston and Calhoun County," circa 1982.
- [11] Tabulation of results of survey of Installation Compatible Use Zone Studies at 22 TRADOC installations, circa April 1986.

[12] US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, "Environmental Noise Assessment No. 52-34-0430-82, Grenade Range Noise Levels at Two Prospective Sites, Fort McClellan, Alabama, 22-23 February 1982," Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010, 22 March 1982.

[13] US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, "Installation Compatible Use Noise Zone Study No. 52-34-0444-83, Fort McClellan, Alabama, 17-22 May 1982, Phase 1," Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010, 8 November 1982.

[14] US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, "Installation Compatible Use Noise Zone Study No. 52-34-0444-84, Fort McClellan, Alabama, 5 June-13 July 1984, Final Phase," Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010, undated.

[15] US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, "Environmental Noise Assessment 52-34-0415-85, Installation Compatible Use Zone Contours, Fort McClellan, Alabama, 8-12 April 1985," Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010, 4 June 1985.

[16] US Army Training and Doctrine Command, "Installation Compatible Use Zone (ICUZ): Executive Briefing Read Ahead," circa 1983.

[17] US Army Training and Doctrine Command, "Installation Compatible Use Zone (ICUZ): Community Involvement Training Course Manual," undated.

APPENDIX A:

ICUZ STUDIES AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT*

* This material is reprinted from the TRADOC ICUZ Community Involvement Training Course Manual, Section 1 (Reference 17)

SECTION 1

ICUZ STUDIES AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

ICUZ STUDIES AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Installation Compatible Use Zones (ICUZ) is the name given to a study process in which an analysis is made of noise generated by Army activities -- such as artillery, explosives, vehicle movement, aircraft -- and the impact of this noise on the surrounding community. Present and future incompatible land uses on lands adjoining the installation are identified, and an effort is made to negotiate joint agreements with local communities or other agencies to prevent or minimize these incompatible uses.

The purpose of ICUZ is to prevent degradation of the installation's mission due to political controversy and litigation over noise impacts, while at the same time protecting the health and safety of the local community.

The ICUZ process is proactive in that it not only assesses current uses of adjoining land which are not compatible, but also assesses land use patterns which could lead to conflict in the future. ICUZ not only looks at current activities on the installation, but considers the noise impacts which could occur with the next generation of weapons or maneuvers. Instead of waiting for controversy, the ICUZ study process attempts to take steps NOW to prevent these conflicts from becoming unmanageable.

The ICUZ study process also fulfills the Army's obligations under the Noise Control Act of 1972. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Logistics and Financial Management has directed that the Army complete the bulk of its obligations under the Noise Control Act by FY 1987.

Establishing Noise Zones

The starting point in the ICUZ process is to identify the noise generated on the installation. Through the use of a sophisticated computer model the impacts of these noises are projected on maps of the community, so that it is possible to identify noise zones. The basis for the zones is the impact of the noise on housing, schools, churches -- those parts of the community which require quiet. In Zone I the noise impact on these uses is acceptable. In Zone II the impacts are generally unacceptable, and in Zone III unacceptable.

These noise zones are not just lines on a map, but translate into important limitations for the Army on where personnel can be housed. While military personnel can be housed in existing buildings in a Zone II area, new housing could be built in this zone only if designed to insulate from the noise impacts. No new housing would be built in a Zone III area, in order to protect the health and safety of military personnel.

These same kinds of policies extend out into the community through the policies observed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Veterans Administration in granting mortgages. Considerable caution is exercised in granting mortgages in the Zone II area, and the design of any new housing located in Zone II would have to provide for noise protection or no mortgage would be granted. No mortgages will be given for new housing in Zone III.

The consequences of ignoring the potential impacts of noise controversies on mission can be grave indeed. Many installations which were once geographically isolated are becoming surrounded by development. The potential for political controversy or litigation regarding noise issues resulting from this growth pattern is considerable, and when projections are made of probable development around Army installations by the year 2000, the potential problems are very substantial indeed.

And the problem is not just that development is moving in on the installations. The noise being generated by the installations is also increasing. The next generation of weapons will be louder and noisier. The proposed Division 86 includes both larger weapons and greater air and ground mobility, increasing the area and sources of noise impacts.

Noise problems that were once minimal are becoming a much more significant problem, and can become a dramatically greater problem in the future. In order to prevent the problem from reaching significant proportions it will be necessary to work with local communities to prevent incompatible land use from occurring, and take reasonable steps on the installation to protect the community from noise. Since the regulation of land use on adjoining land is the authority of local communities, the Army cannot solve these problems unilaterally. We must work with local communities to get the kind of controls which will prevent our noise problems from growing even larger.

The Threat

The threat is that as noise impacts increase, so can both litigation and political pressures which could result in degradation of the installation's mission. Not only does the number of complaints to installation commanders increase dramatically, but so does the number of complaints to powerful Congressmen.

Already the Army has had to bow to political reality on several noise related issues. Fort Belvoir, for example, has severe restrictions on the size of explosives which can be used, and this has made it necessary to move a portion of the Army Engineers field training program to Fort A.P. Hill. Fort Dix has significant limitations on when and what kind of weapons can be fired. Without effective action now, a number of bases will be under increasing pressure to modify their activities to reduce noise impacts.

The History of Noise Controversy

The Army is not alone in dealing with these kinds of problems, in fact if anything we have been blessed that we have not had to deal with the problem sooner.

The first people to suffer major problems were the commercial airports. With the advent of jet aircraft in the fifties many airports became the target of intense public outcry. In 1964 Congress revised the Federal Aid to Airports Act to make federal aid contingent upon implementation of programs to resolve noise problems with surrounding neighborhoods. Subsequently Congress passed the Noise Control Act of 1972 and the Quiet Communities Act. Under these laws, airports carried out noise control measures such as outright purchase of adjoining land, working with local communities to insure zoning which would permit only compatible uses, insulation programs to reduce noise impacts on existing buildings, developing procedures for including noise information in the consumer disclosure documents provided when real estate is sold, altering run-up procedures and locations, and changing approach and take-off patterns. At the present time the FAA has specific requirements for community involvement in all airport planning, and has developed training programs and a manual on community involvement.

The Federal Aid to Airports Act exempted military aircraft, as did portions of the Noise Control Act of 1972. However the Noise Control Act and the Quiet Communities Act did contain language outlining the responsibilities of federal agencies in protecting the public from unreasonable noise impacts. Specifically these laws state that:

"Federal agencies shall, to the fullest extent consistent with their authority under federal laws administered by them, carry out the programs within their control in such a manner as to ... promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes their health and welfare."

Acting under these directives, and with additional emphasis added by the noise impact provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and Executive Order 12088, the DOD has developed the ICUZ process as a means of carrying out its responsibilities in this area.

The Navy and the Air Force were called on first to implement the ICUZ process, primarily because they operate large jet aircraft which generate large quantities of noise complaints, while noise complaints about Army aircraft primarily concern helicopters.

The Air Force and Navy have taken somewhat different approaches. Air Force policy has been to buy-up noise-impacted adjoining land. But the Navy, whose bases are located in more urbanized settings where land values are much higher, has worked instead to get commitments from local

communities to enact zoning controls or take other cooperative measures to mitigate impacts. The Navy has estimated that without this cooperation from local communities it would require another \$200 million (in 1979 dollars) to purchase noise-impacted lands.

The Army's Legal Position

The problems we face as a result of noise impacts may be more political than legal. It is the opinion of legal counsel that the Army could defend itself legally against most lawsuits. This opinion is based on a series of important court cases, many of which have involved litigation regarding aircraft noise on Air Force bases -- which may be some indication of how seriously the public can take noise issues.

These cases dealt with the three grounds on which someone could be expected to sue because of a noise problem: trespass, nuisance, and "taking" or inverse condemnation.

"Trespass" involves an invasion of the owner's exclusive use of the land. Generally speaking the courts have been unwilling to accept that noise constitutes a physical invasion, which is the crucial test of whether or not there is a trespass.

"Nuisance" means to create or continue a condition which causes harm to the interests of a nearby landowner with the knowledge that it will harm the landowner's interests. There are several possible defenses against a nuisance lawsuit, but the most fundamental is that the U.S. Government has preempted control of aircraft noise and therefore has sovereign immunity so long as agencies are carrying out their discretionary functions. Noise issues appear to be legitimate discretionary functions. The courts have ruled, for example, that an Air Force decision to locate a jet engine trim pad on an Air Force base was a legitimate discretionary function and subject to immunity. Similarly the selection of the Aberdeen Proving Ground as a site for a proving ground, as well as the location of firing positions, weapon size, etc. were all proper discretionary functions and subject to immunity.

"Taking" is an action short of occupancy whose effects are so complete as to deprive an owner of all or most of his interest in his property. The major cases in which these grounds for a lawsuit have been tested involved landowners living adjoining Air Force bases. Basically these decisions have all been in favor of the government, although in one case the courts ruled that while noise by itself did not constitute "taking", frequent low overflights did, and the government was ordered to pay compensation.

The Army may be vulnerable on these grounds in places such as Fort Rucker, where the helicopter training mission results in numerous low overflights. There has already been one incident of shots fired on military aircraft.

At present it appears that the Army's position in the event of a lawsuit would be strong, although there remain a number of important cases pending which could affect the Army's position. In particular it should be noted that most of the existing case law is on the issue of aircraft noise. Since much of the noise from Army installations involves other noise sources, there could be a different outcome on new cases.

The one grounds on which the Army could be vulnerable is if it failed to take the actions required under the Noise Control Act of 1972, the Quiet Communities Act of 1978, DODI 5100.50 and AR 200-1.

As mentioned earlier, the Assistant Secretary of the Army has directed that the Army will complete the bulk of its obligations under these directives by the end of FY 1987.

However, despite the likelihood of being able to ultimately win in the courts, the Army could still be forced to cope with consistent nuisance and expense resulting from litigation. This is the kind of battle of attrition that one can win and still lose.

After completing a review of the Army's legal position the Coastal Engineering Research Laboratories reached the conclusion that "the best way for the Army to prevent litigation, or the threat of a suit, is to avoid situations severe enough that the civilian community feels bound to seek restitution in the state or federal court system."

The Federal Claims Service, which handles requests for federal compensation resulting from noise complaints, has reached a similar conclusion, deciding that the ill-will created by noise impacts is sufficiently severe that it can produce continuous controversy and bad feelings. As a result it has a policy of granting compensation for verified noise impacts despite the government's limited legal liability.

The problem with a "hang-tough" approach is that such an approach can result in ill-will in local communities. The result can be a community unwilling to work with the Army to regulate land use. Community ill-will can result in pressure from local Congressmen, sometimes resulting in political pressures which force unilateral concessions on the part of the Army without reciprocal concessions from the community. Or we end up in lawsuits, with the results that the Courts are the real decision makers, often making decisions on minor technical grounds rather than the broadest public interest. And even if we win the suits there is the danger of temporary restraining orders which could restrict installation operations until the legal issues are resolved. And most important of all -- while the battle goes on significant residential development can be taking place in noise-impacted areas, so that the problem will be getting worse, not better. And at the same time that residential development will be encroaching on the installation, we will be introducing the noisier next generation of weapons and maneuvers.

Installation commanders need a process for dealing with these problems other than just stonewalling or unilateral concessions. They need the tools to actively manage the noise problem, not just react to crises. ICUZ is designed to be this sort of tool.

What Can be Done to Reduce Noise Impacts

The primary way in which installations can deal with noise problems is to alter and restrict the way their mission is currently being implemented. A list of possible steps which installations can take includes:

- relocate activities away from surrounding properties
- move firing points
- utilize accoustical enclosures or suppressors
- use more simulation
- fire more training rounds
- alter approach and climb patterns for aircraft
- acquire adjoining property.

Sometimes this can be done with little impact on mission. Perhaps another location for firing points is just as effective. Perhaps it is possible to do more simulation or fire more training rounds instead of live ammunition. But these kinds of accommodations can only go so far before it does begin to impact on the installation's ability to carry out its mission.

A look at the list of things which the community can do reveals a much wider range of alternatives. This list would include:

- zoning limitations
- transfer of development rights
- special districts
- building codes (insulation)
- subdivision regulations
- health codes
- disclosure of noise levels
- municipal land acquisition
- tax increment finances
- land banking
- financing incentive for compatible development
- capital improvement program.

It is even likely that many local communities are unaware that they possess this range of powers. And there are differences in local powers from state to state. But there is nothing on this list which has not been utilized somewhere in this country to deal with aircraft noise at commercial airports. This is not to suggest that these solutions are all easy. There may be definite costs to the community such as limits on growth in the community, loss of tax revenues, possible increases in expenditures, etc.

The Role of the Local Community

The key point in looking at these lists is the number of powers which do not lie in the hands of the installation commander, but in the hands of the local community or other state or local agencies. The real power to implement is often outside the hands of the installation commander. Given this separation of powers, even unilateral concessions on the part of the Army do not ensure reciprocal steps from the local community.

Not that the Army is without some power in the situation. When the Army develops noise contours identifying incompatible land uses due to noise, both the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Veterans Administration (VA) can withhold federal financing for projects in the noise-impacted areas.

But experience has shown that use of this power by the Army produces great ill-will and political pressure. In fact, simply announcing contours can result in controversy because this is seen as reducing the value of real estate because of a decline in desirability, creating difficulties in getting financing, or prohibiting future uses.

Given this level of controversy there is a need to establish a process which involves the community in such a way that it doesn't appear that any noise contours and plans are simply arbitrary and unilateral actions on the part of the government. And -- since the crucial problem is to secure implementation -- implementation will only take place if the emphasis in the ICUZ process is on negotiating reciprocal agreements with local communities.

Air Force and Navy Community Involvement Approaches

In developing the ICUZ process for TRADOC installations both the Air Force and Navy programs' approaches to dealing with local communities were reviewed.

In the Air Force program the emphasis was on land acquisition, and there was relatively little contact with the public. The problems which occurred -- and they were not major -- resulted from the perception of the local communities that they were being "swallowed up" by the government. There were also complaints by local entities about additional lands being removed from the tax base.

The Navy program placed greater emphasis on public contact, since the Navy hoped for local implementation. But in the final analysis the Navy did not attempt to achieve agreements, but simply reported in each ICUZ report the steps which the local communities could take, and what the installation would do. This means that implementation will be uneven, and the installation has committed itself without a reciprocal commitment from the local communities.

The emphasis in the ICUZ process developed for TRADOC installations is not on the final report, but is placed instead on achieving negotiated joint agreements, which are then documented by the final report. This emphasis on mutual problem-solving with the local communities puts the installation commander in the position of a manager of conflict, rather than simply reacting to conflict by stonewalling or unilateral concessions. It is proactive rather than reactive.

Steps in the ICUZ Process

The minimum ICUZ process involves these steps:

1. Prepare noise zone maps.
2. Identify existing or potential incompatible land uses.
3. Prepare a draft report identifying alternative actions.
4. Review by Installation Planning Board/community.
5. TRADOC/DA review of proposed solutions.
6. Provide official report to the public.
7. Implement action plan.
8. Update and review.

As indicated, the ICUZ process begins with the development of the noise zone contours. These are then compared with land use planning maps or other guides to probable development in the community. This permits identification of those present or future uses which are incompatible with the noise zone in which they are located. A factory or a storage business located in Zone II or III may be completely compatible, but housing, churches, or schools are all potentially incompatible uses.

Once the incompatible uses are identified the next step is to identify the alternative actions which could be taken to reduce existing problems and prevent future ones. We've already described some of the alternatives including restrictions on installation operations, insulation programs for schools or churches, land use regulations to prevent future development in noise-impacted areas, outright purchase of noise-impacted lands. These alternatives are then evaluated and summarized in a draft report which is reviewed by the installation Planning Board, and is also reviewed with the appropriate officials from the local community. This could be the city council, a planning commission, or even a county judge.

Following this review, and any revisions that need to be made, the report is submitted to TRADOC and the Department of the Army for final

review. The official report is then presented to local officials, and becomes the basis for implementation. Periodically there will be an update and review of the progress which has been made, and this could conceivably kick off another round of planning, if major problems remain.

Community Involvement

This is just the "bare-bones" outline of the process. What doesn't show up here is the steps which are taken to consult with the community -- and the term community is used here as a catch-all term that includes local and state governmental agencies, elected officials, interest groups, impacted homeowners, etc.

If the ICUZ study process were to follow the procedure used on other Army studies the normal consultation with "the public" would be as follows: During the first step the installation would issue a formal Notice of Initiation. This is a part of the A-95 process which has been established to ensure coordination between all the various levels of government. Among the people receiving this notice would be local elected officials, planning officials, etc. The identification of incompatible land uses would be largely an internal process, although clearly there would be a need to get together with local planning officials to review their maps, zoning, etc. The identification of alternatives and the preparation of the draft report would be an internal process.

The major point of consultation would be the formal review of the draft report by the local city council, planning commission, or other local official responsible for land use regulation. Once MACOM and the DA have made their review the publication of the final report would be announced with a press release, and copies would be given to local agencies. There could be additional press releases during the implementation stage, and whenever there was an update and review.

The problem with this methodology is that it provides only limited interaction with the local community, and then only through official channels. It meets the Army's legal obligations, but little is done to create acceptance, understanding or goodwill with the local community. The problem with this is that we need that community support if we are going to get effective implementation, because significant aspects of implementation can only come from the community.

The ICUZ process to be used by TRADOC installations will utilize extensive interaction with the various publics in an effort to achieve joint agreements with local communities. The final ICUZ report will document this process, including the technical rationale for the agreements reached, but the emphasis is on achieving an agreement, rather than simply producing a report which may just sit on a shelf somewhere and contribute little to implementation.

The ICUZ process which will be followed for TRADOC installations includes these steps:

1. Identify noise-impacted areas.
2. Identify existing or potential incompatible land uses.
3. Identify alternative actions to minimize noise impacts.
4. Evaluate alternative actions.
5. Negotiate draft agreements with local communities and agencies.
6. Submit draft agreements for review by decision makers.
7. Publish final report describing agreements and technical documentation.
8. Implement agreements.
9. Update and review.

At each of these steps there will be opportunities for community involvement.

The Community Involvement Thought Process

The specific techniques to be used for community involvement will be at the discretion of the installation commander and his staff, taking into account the unique circumstances of the installation, the degree of controversy surrounding noise issues at the installation, the characteristics of the local political institutions. But installation commanders will be asked to follow a carefully-designed thought process -- described in Sections 2 and 4 -- which will help them think through the design of their community involvement programs in an orderly and systematic manner.

Implicit in this thought process is the recognition that there is not a single monolithic public, but a number of different kinds of publics. Some publics may be concerned because they hold an official position in the community. Others because the noise impacts directly on them. Others because they are concerned with how the community is growing. Others because they hold real estate in noise-impacted areas which they want to develop in the future. To be credible to the community, any agreement must win acceptance not only of elected leaders, but also of those publics which see themselves as having a stake in the issue.

Experience with previous noise issues suggests that "John Q. Citizen" will not be interested in the ICUZ process unless he or she is directly impacted by noise, by planning regulations, by changes in tax rates, or by some other direct impact.

But even when dealing with only part of the community there are differences in the kind of information you can give or get from the various publics. The public which can understand the technical complexities of accoustical measurement is very small indeed. But the opinion of this small technical elite can be very important in determining whether other public officials -- who rely on this technical elite -- accept the study. In the same way, local planning staff are the logical source of information regarding local planning policies. But if you want to know general public attitudes towards the base, perceptions of whether or not there is a noise problem, etc., then you want to reach out to a larger public.

The reason it is so important to carefully target the publics you want to reach is that this determines the techniques you will use to consult with each public. An appropriate technique for reviewing the technical methodology might be a small technical advisory group. But if you want general public perceptions you might hold community workshops in noise-impacted neighborhoods, or conduct a number of interviews.

The person implementing a community involvement program will need to go through this kind of analysis in order to select from the considerable array of community involvement techniques which have been developed, including:

- public meetings
- public hearings
- informal workshops
- coffee klatches
- interviews
- field trips
- advisory committees or task forces
- computer-based interactive graphics
- questionnaires/response forms/polls
- open houses
- brochures
- newsletters
- hot lines
- news releases.

This list is not exhaustive, but simply includes the most frequently used techniques, or techniques which may have particular suitability for noise-related community involvement.

Community Involvement in Other Federal Agencies

This community involvement approach is consistent with that of other agencies which have been dealing with public conflict over the past fifteen years.

The FAA has developed guidelines regarding community involvement which must be observed in all commercial airport planning. The FAA has concluded that noise impacts are the biggest danger to the future of commercial aviation, and so has made community involvement mandatory. The FAA has issued a community involvement manual and has also conducted training programs in community involvement for its staff and numerous airport operators.

The Civil Works Division of the Corps of Engineers has been a leader in developing community involvement training, having developed four levels of training on the subject. The Institute for Water Resources, the Corps' "think tank", is currently publishing a compendium of guidance in public involvement.

Similarly the Federal Highway Administration has numerous guidelines requiring involvement of the public, developed after public controversy almost brought the interstate highway program to its knees. The FHWA has also prepared a public involvement guide and training programs.

The Bureau of Reclamation has published a public involvement manual, and conducted extensive training in this field, as have other Department of the Interior agencies.

One thing which has been discovered by these other agencies is that there is no one "right" community involvement program which fits all circumstances. This is why it is essential that each installation commander be free to develop his own program, within the outlines of the thought process referred to above. The commander can be assisted in developing his program not only by his own staff, but also by COE personnel, or external consultants contracted through the local District Engineer. A number of COE districts have retained such services in the past, so the contracting expertise is available.

Among the other crucial things which have been learned from other agencies are:

1. The community involvement must be an integral part of the decision-making process in order to ensure that the flow of information back and forth with the public is timely and has impact. Without the community involvement carefully integrated into the decision making there is a considerable chance that the information needed from the public will not be obtained at the time in the process when it can be most useful. There is a danger that if important information from the public is received too late in the process it may be hard to respond to it effectively because commitments have already been made. And when people participate, but feel that their participation doesn't make a difference, they often feel more betrayed than if they hadn't participated at all.

2. The entire process must be open and visible. People trust what they can see and understand. Anytime things start getting handled internally, without an opportunity for people to see and understand what is going on, suspicions begin to build that deals are being cut, decisions made, or agreements abridged. Visibility breeds credibility.
3. When the public feels a sense of genuine participation in the decision-making process they are far more committed to implementation of the plan. This is really the crux of the ICUZ process to be used on TRADOC installations. By getting the local community emotionally invested in solving this problem we create a political climate of cooperation which can result in implementation. Once you've participated in a decision your own self-esteem rides on making it work.

ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS:

This is not to suggest that implementing a program like this is without problems. Some of the problems which can be anticipated include:

There may be some resistance to this interactive approach as undermining the Army's authority. The response to this concern is that the crux of the noise control problem is that the Army does not have authority over many of the actions which can be taken to prevent incompatible uses. Nothing will undermine Army authority more than a heavy-handed approach to local communities whose enthusiastic commitment to implementation is required.

There may be complaints about the expense and time involved in this kind of interactive planning. There is no question that interactive planning does require more staff time than does unilateral planning. However this time will be more than made up for if there is genuine community commitment to implementation.

Unreasonable communities or agencies may make it impossible to achieve agreements. There certainly is no guarantee that agreements can be reached with all communities or agencies. Fortunately, this program is being implemented at a point in time where relations are still relatively good between installations and the surrounding communities, so that the likelihood of intransigence and extreme polarization are relatively low. If no agreements can be reached, then the final report can contain the installation's recommendations, and document the efforts to achieve an agreement. These efforts to achieve an agreement can be important in the courts, and with local Congressmen.

The number of noise complaints received at the installation will increase. This is probably true. Research shows that the number of complaints will increase as people feel an agency is receptive to them, and their complaints may result in some sort of action. In effect this program both gives "permission" to complain, and also suggests that complaining could have an impact. Because of this the criteria will have to shift from a "keeping-the-lid-on" approach to noise complaints, and concentrate instead on how effectively the complaints are responded to.

The process could create unrealistic expectations about how much noise reduction could occur. This is a genuine problem that will have to be guarded against in all presentations, publications, etc.

The technology for defining noise contours is still subject to controversy. In order to attack the findings, people may challenge the methodology. This was certainly the case when initial efforts were made to define noise contours at Fort Sills. The technology is still rough and will unquestionably undergo refinement in the future. The particular weakness of the methodology is that it does not incorporate information about the terrain or atmospheric conditions which could affect noise transmission. But the fact remains that we are using the state-of-the-art methodology accepted by the consensus of technical experts in the field. The Academy of Sciences has reviewed the technology and indicated that it represents the current standard in the field. Because of the controversy at Fort Sills, though, the Assistant Secretary of the Army has issued a directive indicating that whenever a Zone III noise contour extends beyond the boundary of the installation there must be on-site noise monitoring. He has also directed that in such a case the final ICUZ report will be reviewed by his office.

SUMMARY:

The ICUZ study process is designed to protect the mission of the installation from degradation due to litigation or political pressures resulting from noise problems. It does this by identifying current or potentially incompatible uses and developing actions which can be taken to minimize these incompatible uses. Because community commitment is essential for implementation, the ICUZ process to be used on TRADOC installations will include carefully designed community involvement programs for the purpose of developing joint agreements with local communities or state agencies. This puts the installation in a proactive position, managing conflict rather than simply reacting to crises, and ensures that any commitments made by the installations are met with reciprocal commitments from the local community.

APPENDIX B:

FORT McCLELLAN'S COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

FORT MCCLELLAN
INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE
(ICUZ)
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

Fort McClellan

ICUZ

Community Involvement Plan

1. INTRODUCTION: Fort McClellan consists of three parcels of land (45,714 acres) located in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains in northeast Alabama. The main installation adjoins the City of Anniston on the south and west. It is the home of two major Army service schools: US Army Chemical and Military Police Schools. The installation also serves as a basic training center. On the east is a densely wooded stretch of land known as the Choccolocco Corridor, which is leased from the State of Alabama for training purposes. The Corridor connects the main post with the Talladega National Forest. Located approximately eight miles to the west is Pelham Range, the principal field training area used by active Army trainees and units of the National Guard and Army Reserve. The Anniston Army Depot borders Pelham Range to the south.

Historically Fort McClellan has had a good relationship with surrounding civilian communities. Complaints concerning noise generated by Fort McClellan have primarily involved artillery and mortar fire on Pelham Range. An increase of noise complaints from areas adjacent to Pelham Range can primarily be attributed to continual residential development of sparsely populated lands bordering the range and an increase in the training mission on the installation.

This Community Involvement Plan has been developed by Fort McClellan's ICUZ Study Committee. Community leaders will be contacted and involved throughout the study. Because of the absence of zoning regulations on lands adjoining most of Fort McClellan, binding agreements with surrounding communities may prove difficult to formulate. The ICUZ Study Committee, however, has initiated discussions with the East Alabama Regional Planning Commission (EAC).

2. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED: If incompatible land uses are identified, the ICUZ Study Committee with input from the civilian community will address:

- a. Possible changes in the land use plan for Calhoun County.
- b. Possible creation of zoning regulations in Calhoun County.
- c. Possible changes in where and how armor and artillery training is conducted.
- d. Possible acquisition of additional land for buffer zones through land purchase or noise easements.
- e. Possible notification to home buyers through the Board of Realtors or other civic organizations.
- f. Other alternatives addressed by community.

3. PUBLIC INTEREST: With the exception of residential and rural communities bordering Pelham Range, public interest in the ICUZ Study at Fort McClellan is expected to be minimal. As noted previously, land surrounding Pelham Range is primarily rural and only recently has begun to develop residential communities. Most residential development has taken place to the east of the range, which provides an easy commute to job centers located in Anniston and Fort McClellan. Development to the north and west of Pelham Range primarily involves existing rural communities and isolated farms or strip development along secondary roads. Residents located in these areas have submitted noise complaints involving artillery fire in the past and can be expected to have an interest in this ICUZ Study and in the future of tank and artillery training at Fort McClellan. The generation of noise on Pelham Range has received coverage in both local newspapers and on television stations.

During the initial step of the ICUZ process, town mayors and members of the Calhoun County Commission will be contacted and requested to provide input. During subsequent steps, other community residents and groups will be included in the study as appropriate. The EAC can provide guidance in selecting the appropriate groups and individuals to contact during the study.

4. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN: Steps shown correspond to the nine steps required in the ICUZ process.

STEPS 1 AND 2: Identify noise-impacted areas and existing or potential incompatible land uses.

Community Action: A letter from the post commander will be sent to the mayors of Anniston, Ohatchee, Weaver, Blue Mountain, Jacksonville, Hobson City, Oxford and Piedmont, and to the Chairman of the Calhoun County Commission, Calhoun County and the EAC. The letter will inform the community leaders that the ICUZ Study is underway at Fort McClellan. Further, it will solicit comments and information as to each communities' interest and opinions on how seriously noise impacts upon living conditions. The letter will request information (land use and zoning maps) which indicates current and future land use near the installation boundary. The letter will also ask for suggested actions which both the community and the installation can take to alleviate any perceived current or future incompatible land uses. Other interested groups will also be contacted concerning possible methods of providing information to new home buyers.

Time: Letter mailed NLT 7 January 85.
Replies required by 7 February 85.

NOTE: 60 days to analyze responses and draft noise contour map.

STEP 3: Identify alternative actions to minimize noise impacts.

Action: The ICUZ Study Committee will develop a list of alternative actions which can be taken by both the community and the installation. The list will be based on input obtained from the community and the committee's knowledge of installation operation.

Time: NLT 7 June 85

STEP 4: Evaluate alternative actions.

Action: The ICUZ Study Committee will document and evaluate the practicality and acceptability of each alternative action. Leaders or representatives from interested communities, agencies, groups and some selected nearby residents will be invited to participate in the committee meetings.

Time: Complete 60 days after Step 3 (approximately 7 August 85).

STEP 5: Negotiate draft agreements with local communities.

Action: The ICUZ Study Committee will draft an agreement based on the results of Step 4. Draft agreements will be sent to the local governments involved. If the agreements are acceptable to the community, the installation will execute the agreement if approved by TRADOC and HQDA. It should be recognized, however, that the absence of zoning regulations on most lands surrounding Fort McClellan may hinder the ability of community leaders to execute binding agreements.

Time: Letters of intent received NLT 7 October 85.

STEP 6: Submit draft agreements and letters of intent to TRADOC.

Action: Installation shall forward copies to the staff at TRADOC.

Time: NLT 7 November 85.

STEP 7: Publish final report describing agreements and technical documentation.

Action: The ICUZ Study Committee will prepare the final report including the approved agreements. The agreements will have been signed by the post commander and the appropriate official of the communities.

Time: Report complete NLT 7 January 85.

STEP 8: Implement agreements.

Action: The ICUZ Study Committee will maintain contact with installation activities and communities to assure agreements are honored.

Time: From 7 January 86.

STEP 9: Update and review.

Action: The ICUZ Study Committee will meet once annually to consider appropriate action.

Time: From 7 January 87.

5. AGREEMENTS MAY BE NEGOTIATED WITH:

- a. Calhoun County
- b. City of Anniston
- c. Town of Ohatchee
- d. City of Weaver
- e. Town of Blue Mountain
- f. City of Jacksonville
- g. City of Oxford
- h. Hobson City
- i. City of Piedmont
- j. Other nongovernmental groups

Alan A. Nord
ALAN A. NORD
Major General, USA
Commanding

18 Dec 1984

APPENDIX C:

LETTER INFORMING COMMUNITIES OF ICUZ PROGRAM

DRAFT

Public Affairs Office

As part of the Army's emphasis on resolving conflict with civilian communities over use of military property for training, I have started a program known as the Installation Compatible Use Zone (ICUZ) Program. It will attempt to establish a means of controlling the development of incompatible land uses on property bordering Fort McClellan and Pelham Range where loud noise could be a problem.

Initially the program will deal with noise problems but will be expanded later to include other issues. Because Fort McClellan can't solve the problem of noise unilaterally, it is important that our neighboring communities participate in finding solutions agreeable to both the military and the public.

I would like to solicit your comments on how existing noise impacts on the living conditions of the citizens in your community. I also need to know your plans for development of land adjacent to the post as well as any existing ordinances which may apply. Other groups or individuals that live in your community that might have an interest in participating are being identified. Any suggestions on specific contacts that you recommend would be greatly appreciated.

Fort McClellan wants to continue being a good neighbor in Calhoun County. Through the active participation of interested communities, I am confident that solutions can be found to minimize future problems of incompatible land use.

If you have any further questions on the ICUZ Program, please feel free to contact Major Quentin Banks, Jr., my Public Affairs Officer, at 238-5377 or Mr. Albert Goree, my Community Relations Officer, at 238-5575.

Sincerely,

Alan A. Nord
Major General, U.S. Army
Commanding

APPENDIX D:

SUMMARY PLAN OF ACTION FOR FORT McCLELLAN

INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE (ICUZ)

Summary Plan of Action for Fort McClellan

Fort McClellan is currently initiating a study of Army generated noise and the impacts of this noise on surrounding civilian and military communities. This study is entitled the "Installation Compatible Use Zone Study" and is commonly known as the ICUZ Program. Present and future incompatible uses on lands adjoining the installation will be identified, and an effort will be made to negotiate joint agreements with local communities and other groups to prevent or minimize these incompatible uses.

Noise problems that were once minimal are becoming a much more significant issue, and can become an even greater problem in the future. In order to prevent the problem from reaching significant proportions it will be necessary to work with local communities to prevent incompatible land use from occurring, and take reasonable steps on the installation to protect the community from noise. Since the regulation of land use on adjoining properties is the authority of local communities, the Army cannot solve these problems unilaterally. We must work with local communities to implement the kind of controls which will prevent problems from becoming even more serious. If controls cannot be implemented, some method must be established to inform and educate the public on the potential results of developing lands adjacent to installation boundaries.

Establishing Noise Zones

The starting point in the ICUZ process is to identify the noise generated on the installation. Through the use of a sophisticated computer model the impacts of these noises are projected on maps of the community, so that it is possible to identify noise zones. The basis for the zones is the impact of the noise on housing, schools, churches and those parts of the community which require a quiet environment. In Zone I the noise impact on these uses is acceptable. In

Zone II the impacts are generally unacceptable, and in Zone III unacceptable. These noise zones are not just lines on a map, but translate into important limitations for both the Army and civilian community. For example, these zones are used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Veterans Administration in granting mortgages. Considerable caution is exercised in granting mortgages in the Zone II area, and the design of any new housing located in Zone II would have to provide for noise protection or no mortgage would be granted. No mortgages will be given for new housing in Zone III.

Preliminary studies by the US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency indicate that Zone III is currently confined to military land on Fort McClellan. Zone II contours, however, extend slightly onto non-military lands that are currently undeveloped.

Reduction of Noise Impacts

There are a number of possible approaches that can be taken by the installation and local communities to minimize the impact of noise. The primary way in which Fort McClellan can deal with noise problems is to alter and restrict the way their mission is currently being implemented. Although the extent of these modifications must be assessed on a case by case basis, a list of some possible steps that could be considered is provided below.

- relocate activities away from surrounding properties
- move firing points
- utilize acoustical enclosures or suppressors
- use more simulation
- fire more training rounds
- alter approach and climb patterns for aircraft
- acquire adjoining property

Unilateral steps taken by the installation, however, only deal with existing

problems and fail to address the source of the problem, which lies in continual development within noise sensitive areas adjacent to installation boundaries. Civilian communities must also become involved in dealing with these problems and can implement a number of actions to minimize potential conflicts on property surrounding Fort McClellan. A list of some approaches that have been used in similar situations in the United States are provided below.

- zoning limitations
- transfer of development rights
- special districts
- building codes (insulation)
- subdivision regulations
- health codes
- disclosure of noise levels
- municipal land acquisition
- land banking
- financing incentive for compatible development
- capital improvement program

Community Involvement Program

An integral part of the ICUZ study is the establishment of an active community involvement program. An ICUZ Study Committee has been formed on Fort McClellan and will be responsible for supervising this program and interacting with interested communities, groups and individuals. The purpose of this program will be to achieve negotiated mutual agreements with local communities and interested groups which protect the mission of the installation and minimize noise impacts upon the communities. The secondary purposes of the community involvement program are to: (1) maintain the Army's position as a good neighbor in the community; (2) inform the community of alternative actions and their potential impacts; (3) solicit information from the public regarding

possible impacts, future development in the community, and the acceptability of proposed actions; and (4) maintain an open and visible decision-making process which is fair and equitable to different groups and individuals within the community.

The community involvement program was initiated as of January 1985 and a "Community Involvement Plan" has been developed that outlines the specific steps of the program and milestones for completion. The program is expected to be completed by January 1986 and will involve the participation of both the military and civilian communities. A summary of the seven major steps in the program are provided below.

STEPS 1 AND 2: Identify noise-impacted areas and existing or potential incompatible land uses.

A letter from the Post Commander will be sent to the mayors and civic leaders of communities within Calhoun County to inform them that the ICUZ Study is underway and to solicit comments and information on each community's interest in the study. During this stage of the study Fort McClellan will finalize noise contours for areas adjacent to the installation. Fort McClellan will provide this information to interested communities and groups so that they can base their degree of involvement on extent that the ICUZ program actually affects their community.

STEP 3: Identify alternative actions to minimize noise impacts.

The ICUZ Study Committee will develop a list of alternative actions which can be taken by both the community and the installation. The list will be based on input obtained from the community and the committee's knowledge of installation operation.

STEP 4: Evaluate alternative actions.

The ICUZ Study Committee will document and evaluate the practicality and acceptability of each alternative action. Leaders or representatives from interested communities, agencies, groups and some selected nearby residents will be invited to participate in the committee meetings.

STEP 5: Negotiate draft agreements with local communities.

The evaluations made during STEP 4 will provide a basis for developing draft agreements with local communities or interested groups. These agreements will be forwarded to interested parties for their acceptance.

STEP 6: Submit draft agreements and letters of intent to TRADOC.

The installation shall forward copies to the staff at Headquarters, US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC).

STEP 7: Publish final report describing agreements and technical documentation.

Fort McClellan will prepare the final report including the approved agreements. The agreements will have been signed by the post commander and the appropriate official of the communities.

STEP 8: Implement agreements.

The ICUZ Study Committee will maintain contact with installation activities and communities to assure agreements are honored.

STEP 9: Update and review.

The ICUZ Study Committee will meet once annually to consider appropriate action.

The final "Community Involvement Plan" or further information on the ICUZ program on Fort McClellan can be obtained through Fort McClellan's Public Affairs Office (238-5575).

END

1-87

DTIC