

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**BRAC 05 Realignment
of
Fort Eustis, Virginia**

Recommendations of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission made in conformance with the provisions of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Base Closure Act), Public Law 101-510, as amended, require the realignment of Fort Eustis, VA.

The most significant changes to Fort Eustis would be from the Commission recommendation to close Fort McPherson, GA and Fort Monroe, VA. Fort McPherson's closure requires relocation of the US Army Installation Management Command (IMCOM) Southeast Region Headquarters and the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Southeastern Region Headquarters to Fort Eustis. Closure of Fort Monroe includes relocation of the US Army Training & Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Headquarters (HQ), the IMCOM Northeast Region Headquarters, the NETCOM Northeast Region Headquarters and the Army Contracting Agency (ACA) Northern Region Office to Fort Eustis. Fort Eustis would experience losses from realignments of the Transportation Center and School and Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command. The Joint Task Force – Civil Support (JTF-CS) will also be relocated from Fort Monroe to Fort Eustis as a BRAC discretionary action. As a result of these movements, there would be a net increase in manpower at Fort Eustis of approximately 324 active duty personnel, 569 civilians, and 142 contractor personnel.

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and its implementing regulations, the Army has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of this proposed realignment. The EA has been developed in accordance with NEPA and implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1500–1508), the Army (32 CFR Part 651), and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Base Redevelopment and Realignment Manual - DoD 4165.66M).

Proposed Action

In implementing the Commission recommendations, the realignment of functions away from Fort Eustis will begin first. Building 661 will be vacated by the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (moving to Scott Air Force Base, IL) and portions of Building 705 will be vacated by the Army Transportation Center and School (moving to Fort Lee, VA). These vacancies are components of the proposed plan for occupancy by the incoming functions and personnel from the associated installations being closed. These two buildings will be renovated before being reoccupied. Renovation will accommodate a significant number of TRADOC HQ personnel. For the remaining majority, new facilities will be constructed on open land within Fort Eustis' cantonment area. Accompanying new BRAC construction will be General and Flag Officers Quarters (GFOQ). The site proposed for this housing project is within the cantonment area near Summerall Circle and adjacent to Antwerp Village.

Alternatives Considered

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 must be described because it is the baseline condition or the current status of the environment if the proposed action were not implemented. For actions directed by the BRAC Commission, it will be noted that for the No Action Alternative, maintenance of current conditions is not feasible, since the BRAC actions are required to be implemented by the BRAC

legislation. Under the No Action Alternative, Fort Eustis would not be implementing the proposed action.

Alternatives for implementation of the proposed action have been examined according to three variables: means to accommodate realigned units, siting of new construction, and schedule. The Alternatives section presents the Army's development of alternatives and addresses alternatives available for the proposed action.

Realignment or relocation of units and the establishment of new units requires that the installation has adequate support facilities for personnel and their operational needs. The Army considers four means of meeting increased space requirements: use of existing facilities, modernization or renovation of existing facilities, leasing of off-post facilities, and construction of new facilities.

With 930 personnel vacating buildings 661 and 705, the incoming functions could reoccupy these facilities in various configurations. One alternative would be for IMCOM East Region (150 personnel) to relocate into Building 705, leaving Building 661 available for the personnel associated with TRADOC Army Capabilities Integration Center (ARCIC) (about 200 personnel). TRADOC HQ would require new construction on open space for the remaining approximately 1300 personnel attached to its relocation.

In another alternative, ACA/NETCOM would collocate with the IMCOM-East in Building 661. Building 705 or portions of building 705 would be used on a short-term basis to accommodate a portion of HQ TRADOC's space requirements or would be used to provide offices for personnel currently located in sub-standard semi-permanent or WWII Wood temporary facilities. TRADOC HQ would still require new construction on open space for all or a major portion of its requirement.

Alternative GFOQ sites considered were near Brown's Lake and near the Third Port marine terminal complex. Brown's Lake site offers some logistic and aesthetic benefits but several long-term ongoing environmental monitoring and clean-up activities in and adjacent to this property are being conducted. Third Port offers scenic views as well as being more remotely located from other family housing areas but is an industrialized area and there are possible facility expansion concerns.

With implementation of any of the alternatives considered, any additional available space that becomes available would be utilized by installation groups currently occupying lesser facilities.

Factors Considered In Determining That No Environmental Impact Statement is Required

The EA, which is incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact, examined potential effects of the proposed action and no action alternative on 13 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, socio-economics, transportation, utilities, and hazardous and toxic substances.

The results of the Army's analysis indicate that the physical and socioeconomic environments at Fort Eustis and in the region of influence would not be significantly affected by realignment. Implementation of the realignment, as proposed, would result in short-term minor adverse effects to air quality and noise. Cultural resources investigations are underway to determine if any historic properties exist within areas of potential effect of the proposed TRADOC HQ and GFOQ construction projects. Section 106 coordination with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (State Historic Preservation Officer) will be carried out and compliance will be satisfied before construction is allowed to begin at either location. Following their review of the EA and draft FNSI, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality generally concurred with the conclusions and findings, they presented specific concerns in their letters of 20 March 2008

and 14 April 2008 that should be considered throughout the design and construction phases of the preferred alternatives. The Commonwealth concluded in the 14 April 2008 letter that the proposal is consistent with the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Plan and the recommendations described in that letter are reflected in the revised Final EA.

No significant adverse effects are expected to occur with respect to any of the above listed resources. Known, potential, and cumulative effects resulting from implementing the proposed action on the physical and natural environment will not be significant.

Conclusion

On the basis of the findings of the EA, 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 1500), and 32 CFR 651 Environmental Analysis Of Army Actions, and after careful review of the potential impacts, I conclude that implementation of the proposed action or any of the alternatives 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 a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

I have also concluded that the No Action Alternative would not support Congressional requirements under the BRAC law (Public Laws 101-510 and 107-107); consequently, it has not been selected for implementation.

Public Involvement

Interested parties who had questions about this action, or who wanted to request a copy of the EA and Draft FNSI for review were directed to contact Mr. Tim Christensen by phone at (757) 878-2375 ext 21 or Tim.Christensen@us.army.mil.

Comments on the EA and/or Draft FNSI were requested within 30 days of the 20 February 2008 publication for receipt by Mr. Tim Christensen, Chief, Conservation Branch, Environmental Division, US Army Garrison, IMNE-EUS-PW-E, 1407 Washington Blvd., Fort Eustis, VA 23604 or Tim.Christensen@us.army.mil. The EA was available throughout the 30-day review period on the Web at http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/env_ea_review.htm and at the following locations:

Virgil I. Grissom Library
366 DeShazor Drive
Newport News, VA 23608
(757) 369-3190

Main Street Library
110 Main Street
Newport News, VA 23601
(757) 591-4858

Public Law Library
2500 Washington Ave.
Newport News, VA 23607
(757) 926-8678

Date: 19 May 08



ANDREW W. BOWES
Colonel, U.S. Army
Garrison Commander