

1 **Draft**

2 **Finding of No Significant Impact**  
3 **for the Implementation of Master Planning Actions at the Mission District of**  
4 **Pine Bluff Arsenal, AR**

5 **1. Introduction.** Pine Bluff Arsenal (PBA) in Arkansas conducted an Environmental  
6 Assessment (EA) of the potential environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic effects associated  
7 with implementing real property master planning actions in its Mission District pursuant to the  
8 Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (Title 40 of the *Code of Federal*  
9 *Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508) for implementing the procedural provisions of the National  
10 Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Title 42 of the *United States Code* 4321 *et seq.*) and 32 CFR  
11 Part 651 (*Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*). Regulations in 32 CFR part 651 provide  
12 Army guidance and procedures for complying with NEPA and establish policy, procedures, and  
13 responsibilities for assessing environmental effects of proposed Army actions.

14 **2. Proposed Action.** The purpose of the proposed action is to manage PBA's real property  
15 assets in a thoughtful, deliberative, and sustainable manner consistent with the requirements  
16 and guidance in Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 4165.70, *Real Property Management*,  
17 and DoD Unified Facilities Criteria 2-100-01, *Installation Master Planning*. The proposed action  
18 is needed to address PBA's real property deficiencies, shortcomings, and suboptimal conditions  
19 and to provide safe, flexible, and efficient facilities to meet current and future installation mission  
20 requirements efficiently and cost effectively. The EA evaluates the implementation of real  
21 property master planning projects from the PBA Mission District Area Development Plan (ADP)  
22 and Area Development Execution Plan (ADEP) over the next 6 years. The proposed action  
23 focuses on implementing the requirements identified in Phase 1 of the ADEP, which include  
24 antiterrorism/force protection (AT/FP) enhancements, renovation of eight buildings, relocation of  
25 operations from two buildings to others, replacing natural gas infrastructure throughout the  
26 district, converting one buildings heat to natural gas, repairing one buildings operations,  
27 repairing sewer infrastructure for one complex of buildings, repairing a viaduct, railroad  
28 improvements, and evaluation of a water distribution system.

29 **3. Alternatives Considered.** PBA identified two alternatives: implementing the proposed  
30 action (which is the Preferred Alternative) and a No Action Alternative. CEQ regulations require  
31 analysis of a No Action Alternative. The proposed action is to implement the real property  
32 master planning projects at PBA's Mission District. Not implementing the planning projects is  
33 the No Action Alternative.

34 **4. Factors Considered in the Finding of No Significant Impact.** The EA, which is attached  
35 and incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), examines the  
36 potential effects of the proposed action and the No Action Alternative on the following resource  
37 areas of concern: aesthetic and visual resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural  
38 resources; geology and soils; hazardous and toxic substances; human health and safety; land  
39 use; noise; socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children); traffic  
40 and transportation; utilities; and water resources (including wetlands).

41 Based on the analysis in the EA, PBA has determined that implementing the proposed action  
42 would not be expected to result in significant adverse effects on any environmental resources,  
43 or cultural or socioeconomic resources. Short-term and/or long-term, negligible-to-minor  
44 adverse effects on aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, cultural, geology and soils,  
45 hazardous and toxic materials, human health and safety, noise, traffic and transportation,  
46 utilities, and water resources would be expected from construction and renovation activity.  
47 Short-term minor beneficial effects on the local economy would be expected from construction

1 and renovation expenditures and employment. Long-term, minor beneficial effects on  
2 aesthetics and visual resources, cultural resources, hazardous and toxic material resources,  
3 human health and safety, and utilities from stormwater management improvements would be  
4 expected. No effects would be expected on biological or land use resources.

5 **5. Public Review and Comment.** The EA and draft FONSI will be available to the public for  
6 review and comment for 30 days, beginning upon publication of a notice of availability in *The*  
7 *Pine Bluff Commercial* newspaper. Copies of the EA and FONSI will be available for review and  
8 comment online at [www.pba.army.mil/Directory.htm](http://www.pba.army.mil/Directory.htm). Submit comments on the EA and FONSI  
9 by U.S. mail to Ms. Cheryl Avery, Public Affairs Officer, Pine Bluff Arsenal, 10020 Kabrich  
10 Circle, Pine Bluff, AR 71602-9500, or by e-mail to [cheryl.d.avery.civ@mail.mil](mailto:cheryl.d.avery.civ@mail.mil). Comments on  
11 the EA and FONSI are to be submitted to Ms. Avery no later than the end of the 30-day review  
12 period.

13 **6. Conclusions.** Based on the environmental analysis in the EA, the Army has determined  
14 that implementing the proposed action would have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative  
15 adverse effects on the quality of human life or the natural environment at PBA. Therefore, the  
16 Army will not be required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement before implementing  
17 the proposed action.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

---

PATRICK S. DAULTON  
COL, U.S. Army  
Commander  
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas

Date