

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI)
FOR THE
LOWER GARRISON DEVELOPMENT
UTAH ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
CAMP WILLIAMS, UTAH**

1. Introduction

The Utah Army National Guard (UTARNG) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic consequences of construction of a Special Forces Group (SFG) Readiness Center and associated road and utility infrastructure at Camp Williams near Bluffdale City, Utah. This Proposed Federal Action must be evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). UTARNG prepared the EA in accordance with NEPA (42 U.S. Code 4321-4370e), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (CEQ Regulations, 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), and *Environmental Analysis of Army Actions* (32 CFR 651).

2. Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is to initiate the UTARNG Lower Garrison Development. This action involves development of lower elevation areas, thus expanding the existing cantonment area developed footprint into adjacent lands. At present this includes construction of a SFG Readiness Center and associated road and utility infrastructure (see Table 1). The total amount of surface disturbance under the Proposed Action would be approximately 769,000 square feet (ft²) (18 acres) of the entire 2,497,165-ft² (57-acre) Proposed Action site.

TABLE 1
Summary Descriptions of Proposed Action

Component	Component Description	Anticipated Impact (approximate)	Known Military Construction (MILCON) Number	Planned Fiscal Year for Construction
Surface Roads	Construction and use of road system for travel of privately owned vehicles and unit equipment	± 250,000 ft ²	Alternative approval process	2016
Utility Infrastructure	Construction and use of utility infrastructure for future facilities	± 54,000 ft ²	Alternative approval process	2016
19 th Special Forces Group Readiness Center	Construction and use of Special Forces Group Readiness Center	± 465,000 ft ²	Project Number 490601	2017
Total ± 769,000 ft ²				

Other Alternatives Considered. In addition to the Proposed Action, UTARNG reviewed other alternatives for meeting its current and future training needs, including the following: use of

another location at Camp Williams, use of other military installations, and purchasing additional land. UT ARNG determined that none of these other alternatives would satisfy the purpose and need for the Proposed Action without greater costs and/or adverse impacts on resources. These other alternatives were considered, but eliminated from analysis.

No Action Alternative. The UTARNG analyzed a No Action Alternative to serve as a benchmark against which the Proposed Action can be evaluated. The No Action Alternative would maintain existing conditions at Camp Williams. Under the No Action Alternative, UTARNG would not proceed with the Lower Garrison Development. Existing structures would not be demolished, new facilities would not be constructed, and no other changes to installation activities would occur. UTARNG Special Forces units would continue to operate out of substandard facilities that are not suitable for current mission requirements.

3. Environmental Analysis

The potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action are fully described in the EA. The EA identifies the environmental resources that could be affected by the Proposed Action and determined the significance of the impacts, if any, to each of those resources.

Conversion of 57 acres of currently undeveloped land could result in short-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts on land use associated with construction activities. Long-term operational impacts would be reduced through best management practices (BMPs), including setback criteria and screening in site design.

Short-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts to air quality would be associated with fugitive dust during construction activities. Impacts would be reduced through BMPs, including water application for dust control. In addition, long-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts would be associated with the creation of permanent sources of air emissions.

Construction-related noise could produce short-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts to both onsite personnel and construction contractors and immediately adjacent land owners. BMPs would reduce impacts by limiting noise to daylight hours during weekdays.

Potential erosion and sedimentation associated with disturbing soils for clearing, paving, and grading would result in short-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts. Similar impacts would result from trenching activities needed for the placement of utilities. Impacts would be reduced through BMPs. Construction activities and new operations could contribute to short- and long-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts to nearby waterways, including the Provo Reservoir Canal and the Utah Lake Distributing Canal. The use of BMPs would reduce impacts on the nearby surface waters, as well as recharge areas for groundwater aquifers.

Approximately 18 acres of vegetation, representing less than 1 percent of the land on Camp Williams, would be removed with the implementation of the Proposed Action, resulting in long-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts. Short- and long-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts on wildlife species would be expected due to disruptions during construction activities with certain species returning after development while others would permanently relocate. Construction activities would also reduce numbers of less-mobile species through collision or loss of habitat. Habitat fragmentation from implementation of the Proposed Action could create localized long-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts on wildlife.

The Proposed Action would result in short- and long-term, positive impacts due to increases in construction and manufacturing employment. New jobs would be associated with implementation of the Proposed Action. Short- and long-term, less-than-significant adverse

impacts associated with disruptions during construction and increased demand during operation would be expected on the water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste management, energy distribution, and traffic systems.

Short -term, less-than-significant adverse impacts could result from the use of hazardous materials during construction activities. Use of personal protective equipment, monitoring, and adherence to Occupational Safety and Health Administration and UTARNG safety requirements would mitigate potential risks.

No impacts to cultural resources or environmental justice would result from the Proposed Action.

4. Mitigation

No mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce any adverse environmental impacts to below significant levels. The UTARNG will implement appropriate Best Management Practices and applicable construction guidelines for new facilities. Additionally, all necessary permits will be obtained prior to implementation of the proposed action.

5. Regulations

The Proposed Action will not violate NEPA, the CEQ Regulations, 32 CFR 651, or any other federal, state, or local environmental regulations.

6. Commitment to Implementation

The National Guard Bureau and UTARNG affirm their commitment to implement this EA in accordance with NEPA. Implementation is dependent on funding. The UTARNG, Army National Guard (ARNG)-ILE, ARNG-TRS, and ARNG-ILI will ensure that adequate funds are requested in future years' budgets to achieve the goals and objectives set forth in the EA.

7. Public Review and Comment

The Public Final EA and Draft FNSI were made available for public review and comments from March 1 through April 4, 2016, at the Salt Lake City Public Library. **XX** comments were received. For further information, contact Robert Price, Environmental Resources Management, Utah Army National Guard, 12953 S. Minuteman Drive, Draper, Utah 84020, Telephone (801) 432-4454, e-mail: robert.price51.nfg@mail.mil.

8. Finding of No Significant Impact

After careful review of the EA, I have concluded that implementation of the Proposed Action would not generate significant controversy or have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Per 32 CFR Part 651, the Final EA and Draft FNSI were available for a 30-day public review and comment period, during which no comments were received. If the projects analyzed in this EA are not implemented within three years following signing of this FNSI, the UTARNG will re-evaluate the analysis conducted in this EA, in concert with ARNG-ILE, and update the analysis if necessary. This analysis fulfills the requirements of

NEPA and the CEQ Regulations. An Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared and the National Guard Bureau is issuing this FNSI.

The EA is intended to be an assessment of components of the Lower Garrison Development that are, or will be, funded and implemented in the near term, namely the SFG Readiness Center and associated road and utility infrastructure. The UTARNG will conduct additional NEPA analysis for future projects included in the Lower Garrison Development at the appropriate time, as needed. This EA will be used as a parent document from which the UTARNG can develop follow-on NEPA analysis for those future projects within the Camp Williams Lower Garrison. A Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) may be prepared, for these new projects depending on their potential environmental affects.

Date

William M. Myer
Colonel, U.S. Army Chief,
Environmental Programs
Division