

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**  
**BRAC 05 Realignment of**  
**Red River Army Depot**  
**and**  
**BRAC 05 Closure of**  
**Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant**

The 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Commission Recommendations (BRAC Recommendations) made in conformance with the provisions of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-510, 10 U.S.C. § 2687 note, as amended (BRAC law), require the closure of Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX (LSAAP) and realignment of a portion of Red River Army Depot, TX (RRAD).

The LSAAP consists of approximately 15,676 acres of land located to the east of RRAD. The 3,835-acre parcel to be realigned at RRAD (RRAD-WEP) is located along the western boundary of RRAD. The Army's proposed action is to dispose of LSAAP and the 3,835 acres of RRAD as mandated by the 2005 BRAC Recommendations. Along with the BRAC disposal, the Army will implement several discretionary actions associated with the BRAC actions. These include a forest harvest plan, a transfer of land between LSAAP and RRAD, and the retention of approximately 1.06 miles of rail track on LSAAP for use by RRAD. The land transfer would result in the addition of approximately 180 acres of RRAD property to the excess area at LSAAP, and the withdrawal of approximately 240 acres from the LSAAP excess property and reassignment of this property to RRAD. After the land swap, the area of the LSAAP excess property would be decreased to approximately 15,617 acres. The area of RRAD-WEP would remain unchanged.

The closure of LSAAP would result in the loss of all Army missions, including movement of storage and demilitarization functions; 105MM and 155MM ICM artillery, MLRS artillery, hand grenades, 60MM and 81MM mortars functions; mines; detonators/relays/delays functions; and demolition charges functions. The partial realignment of RRAD would result in the loss of certain storage, demilitarization, and munitions maintenance functions at the Munitions Center; realignment of the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles; and disestablishment of the supply, storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged petroleum, oil, lubricants, and compressed gases. As a result of the closure and realignment, there would be a net decrease in manpower at RRAD of approximately 257 civilians; and a net decrease in manpower at LSAAP of 2 active duty personnel, 18 civilians, and 129 contractor personnel.

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and its implementing regulations, the Army prepared an environmental assessment (EA) to evaluate the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of this proposed realignment and closure action. The EA was developed in accordance with NEPA, 43 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.*, and implementing regulations, 40 CFR Part 1500–1508, Army regulations (32 CFR Part 651), and Department of Defense policy, Base Redevelopment and Realignment Manual (DoDI 4165.66M). An initial EA was prepared and circulated in October 2007; however, interim actions were added to the proposed action after the initial EA was circulated, and the Army determined that the preparation and circulation of this revised EA (2008) was required.

## **Army Disposal Alternatives Considered**

Section 2905 of the BRAC law provides that the Army does not have to consider the need for closing or realigning a military installation recommended for closure by the Commission. The NEPA analysis should focus on the secondary actions, or the plan to redevelop the property. However, the EA briefly discusses the Army's disposal alternatives: (1) no action alternative, (2) caretaker alternative, (3) early transfer alternative, and (4) traditional transfer. The impacts of the secondary actions will be discussed below.

The no action alternative is included in the EA as required by the CEQ regulations to identify the existing baseline conditions against which potential impacts will be evaluated. The no action alternative describes the baseline or current status of the environment if the proposed action were not implemented. For actions mandated by the 2005 BRAC Recommendations, the no action alternative is not feasible because disposal is required by law.

The EA evaluates a caretaker alternative, which the Army implements if there will be a period of time between installation closure and disposal of the property. Under caretaker status there would be reduced maintenance to levels consistent with federal government standards for surplus properties. Under this alternative, the Army would continue remediation activities as with other disposal alternatives. As discussed in the EA there would be minor adverse impacts for certain resources and minor beneficial effects for other certain resources if the caretaker alternative is implemented.

The early transfer alternative was evaluated in the EA. It is the Army's preferred alternative for disposal of LSAAP and RRAD-WEP. Section 120(h)(3)(C) provides authority to transfer the property prior to completion of cleanup and to defer the CERCLA covenant until cleanup is complete. Property transferred under the early transfer authority must be suitable for the new owner's intended use, and that use must be consistent with protection of human health and the environment. Under this authority, the Governor of the State of Texas must concur with the deferral request for property not listed on the National Priorities List (NPL). There is a small 17-acre NPL site on the LSAAP - the Old Demolition Area (ODA). The EPA must concur on the early transfer and deferral of the CERCLA covenant on the ODA. Under the early transfer alternative for LSAAP the Army will conduct required environmental remediation, waste management and environmental compliance activities subsequent to transfer. This early transfer alternative would result in short term and long term moderate adverse impacts to certain resources and minor beneficial impacts to other resources.

The traditional disposal alternative was also evaluated. The Army is given broad authority to transfer the property to other government agencies or to non-government organizations. Under this alternative, the Army would transfer or dispose of property once environmental remediation and other environmental requirements are completed for individual parcels of the installation. This alternative would result in minor or moderate adverse effects for all resource areas and minor beneficial effects would occur for other resources.

## **Proposed Secondary Actions**

Reuse of the LSAAP and the RRAD-WEP properties by others is a secondary action resulting from disposal of the property by the Army. The Red River Redevelopment Authority (the RRRA) prepared a *Lone Star/Red River Reuse Master Plan* (April 2007) outlining its plan for redevelopment of the LSAAP/RRAD-WEP properties.

Pursuant to this plan redevelopment could include various industrial and commercial enterprises, such as commercial fertilizer production, storage of chemicals and munitions, inert storage and warehousing,

establishment of a regional, multi-modal warehouse/distribution center with rail access and foreign trade zone designation, construction of up to three ethanol plant modules and administrative and maintenance activities. Additionally, landfills or disposal sites could be constructed. As redevelopment progresses new roads or highways might be constructed. It is also anticipated that the Army's contractor, Day and Zimmermann, Inc., who produced and destroyed munitions for the Army when LSAAP was operating, will continue to occupy a portion of LSAAP and continue these activities for the private sector.

The EA analyzed the RRRRA's reuse plan under two reuse alternatives: a Low Intensity Reuse (LIR) scenario and a Medium Low Intensity Reuse (MLIR) scenario. The MLIR scenario could result in a maximum of 5,500 employees and the development of up to 5.5 million square feet of building space. The LIR scenario could result in up to 2,700 employees and the development of up to 2.7 million square feet of space. Based on the RRRRA's reuse plan, the appropriate intensity of analysis is the LIR. The site development plan in the LRA's reuse plan describes approximately 2.2 million square feet of new building development and approximately 1,900 jobs resulting from reuse. Although it is less likely that the MLIR level of intensity would occur at LSAAP and RRAD-WEP, this level was analyzed to ensure that potentially higher impacts would be evaluated.

### **Factors Considered in Determining that No Environmental Impact Statement is Required**

The 2008 EA, which is incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact, examined potential effects of the Army's proposed disposal actions and the secondary actions described in the RRRRA's reuse plan on 12 resource areas and areas of environmental and socioeconomic concern: land use, aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, noise, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, and hazardous and toxic substances.

The results of the Army's analysis indicates that, with the inclusion of mitigation to address potential impacts to wetlands, the physical and socioeconomic environments at LSAAP and RRAD-WEP would not be significantly adversely affected by realignment and closure actions or the subsequent reuse of the property. Implementation of the realignment, closure, and reuse actions, as proposed, would result in short-term and long-term minor adverse effects to all resource areas, and moderate adverse impacts to land use, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and utilities. The Army prepared a programmatic agreement that provides for further cultural resource investigations to determine if there are additional historic resources that must be protected after transfer. All historic resources eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places will be protected by a preservation covenant placed in the deed and will run with the land in perpetuity. The Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Texas State Historic Preservation Office will execute the programmatic agreement, reflecting the Army's Section 106 requirements in the National Historic Preservation Act have been completed. No significant adverse effects are expected to occur with respect to any of the above listed resources. Known, potential, and cumulative adverse effects resulting from implementing the proposed action on the physical and natural environment will not be significant.

### **Public Comment**

Interested persons who had questions about this action or who wanted to request a copy of the EA and Draft FNSI for review were invited to contact Ross Ramsauer, Red River Army Depot, (903) 334-2594 or [Ross.Ramsauer@us.army.mil](mailto:Ross.Ramsauer@us.army.mil). Comments were requested to be returned within 30 days of publication and were to be addressed to Mr. Ramsauer, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, RRAD, 100 Main Drive, Texarkana, TX 75507-5000 or [Ross.Ramsauer@us.army.mil](mailto:Ross.Ramsauer@us.army.mil). The EA was also available for review on the Web at [http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/env\\_ea\\_final.htm](http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/env_ea_final.htm) and at the following locations:

Texarkana Public Library  
600 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Texarkana, TX 75501  
(903) 794-2149

New Boston Public Library  
127 North Ellis Street  
New Boston, TX 75570  
(903) 628-5414

Univ. of Texas at Austin Libraries  
Room Number PCL-2.402  
Austin, TX 78713  
(512) 495-4262

The comment period ended on 31 October 2008. Two comments were received. A response from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA NRCS) concurred that the action would not have significant adverse effects on the environment and natural resources. The Red River Development Authority (RRRA) comments addressed potential impacts related to unrestricted harvesting of timber on compartments not included in the Army's disposition plan or otherwise outside of the control of the RRRA. Both comment letters were evaluated and responses to the comments and concerns raised were prepared as an addendum to the EA and included in the Administrative Record. Responses to comments addressing unrestricted harvesting of timber referred to the EA and its identification of impacts to biological and water resources from timbering practices under reuse conditions, as well as pertinent State and Federal environmental regulations, policies, and procedures will afford some level of restriction of timbering activity for the purpose of protecting certain natural resources, such as wetlands and water quality.

### Conclusion

The EA was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR Part 1500), and Army regulations, 32 CFR 651 Environmental Analysis of Army Actions. Based on the findings of the EA and after careful review of the potential impacts, I conclude that implementation of the Army's proposed action or the alternatives with the inclusion of mitigation to address potential impacts to wetlands, would not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Furthermore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required, and preparation of this Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

Date: 12 April 2010.



ROBERT GRUNDBORG  
LSAAP  
Commander's Representative

Date: 21 April 2010



DANIEL G. MITCHELL  
Colonel, RRAD  
LG Commanding